# THE FRENCH ELEMENT

IN THE

# TRISTAN OF GOTTFRIED OF STRASBOURG

THÈSE PRÉSENTÉE POUR LE DOCTORAT
DE L'UNIVERSITÉ DE RENNES

PAR

J. OBERMEYER

H. C. VAN GRINSVEN, VENLO (HOLLAND)

Thèse Rennes
1928.

# THE FRENCH ELEMENT
# IN THE
# TRISTAN OF GOTTFRIED OF STRASBOURG.

THÈSE PRÉSENTÉE POUR LE DOCTORAT
DE L'UNIVERSITÉ DE RENNES

# ERRATA.

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Page | 16 | | Line 9 | read mention instead of mntion. |
| „ | 18 | | „ 5 | read mentioned instead of mentined. |
| „ | 19 | | „ 30 | read Chrétien instead of Chretien. |
| „ | 20 | (footnote) | „ 2 | read mysterious instead of mysteriuos. |
| „ | 21 | | „ 11 | read certainty instead of certainly. |
| „ | 23 | | „ 14 | read pèlerins instead of pélerins. |
| „ | 23 | | „ 25 | read corroborate instead of correborate. |
| „ | 26 | (footnote) | „ 2 | read mort instead of morte. |
| „ | 42 | | „ 13 | read Chrestien's instead of Chrestien. |
| „ | 43 | | „ 25 | read Cligés instead of Cliges. |
| „ | 46 | | „ 12 | read there instead of their. |
| „ | 55 | | „ 22 | read should instead of shoned. |
| „ | 58 | | „ 4 | read must consequently have found them. |
| „ | 60 | | „ 4 | read Tristan comes to Denmark. |
| „ | 63 | | „ 12 | read it instead of if. |
| „ | 63 | | „ 14 | read it instead of if. |
| „ | 65 | | „ 18 | read the same may be said about. |
| „ | 65 | | „ 22 | read Isôt instead of Isoôt. |
| „ | 72 | | „ 13 | read Érec instead of Erec. |
| „ | 73 | | „ 22 | read rhyme instead of rhymes. |
| „ | 78 | | „ 24 | read facilitated instead of faciltated. |

# THE FRENCH ELEMENT

IN THE

# TRISTAN OF GOTTFRIED OF STRASBOURG

THÈSE PRÉSENTÉE POUR LE DOCTORAT
DE L'UNIVERSITÉ DE RENNES

PAR

J. OBERMEYER

H. C. VAN GRINSVEN, VENLO (HOLLAND)

R. UNIV.
BIBLIOTHEEK
LEIDEN

## BOOKS CONSULTED.


Gottfried von Strassburg,, „Tristan" herausg. von Reinhold Bechstein, Leipzig, Brockhaus, 1873.

Eilhart von Oberg, Tristant, herausg. von Franz Lichtstein, Strassburg, 1877.

Lanson, G., Histoire de la littérature française, 1909.

Julleville, Petit de, Histoire de la langue et littérature françaises.

Muth, Einführung in das Nibelungenlied.

Brockhaus, Realencyclopädie, 1827.

Deutsche Klassiker der Hohenstaufenzeit, Bibliothek der deutschen Klassiker.

Huppe, Bernhard, Geschichte der deutschen Literatur, Coesfeld, 1862.

Piquet, L'Originalité de Gotfried de Strasbourg, Lille, 1905.

Grünstein, Leo, Minnelieder aus Oesterreich, Dichtungen des 12-14 Jahrhunderts, Wien, 1921.

Lefranc, E. M., Histoire de la Littérature Française, Moyen Age, Paris. Lyon, 1840.

Wagner, Kurt, Eilhart von Oberg, Tristant, die alten Bruchstücke.

Béroul, Le Roman de Tristan, poème du 12me siècle, édité par Ernest Muret.

Howald, J., Geschichte der deutschen Literatur. Konstanz.

Holzwarth, F. J., Weltgeschichte, IV. Band Mainz, 1879.

Oehlke, Waldemar, Geschichte der deutschen Literatur. 1919.

Scherer, W. Geschichte der deutschen Literatur. 1917.

Röttiger, Wilhelm, Der heutige Stand der Tristanforschung, Hamburg 1897.

Foerster, Wendelin, Kristian von Troyes, Wörterbuch zu seinen Werken.

Foerster, Wendelin, Kristian van Troyes, Cligés, Halle, 1910.

Hoepffner, Ernest, Les Influences Littéraires de la France sur les Lettres en Alsace, Strasbourg, 1925.

Bédier, Joseph, Le Roman de Tristan par Thomas, I. II. Paris, 1905.

Wilmotte, Maurice, Chrétien de Troyes. Guillaume d'Angleterre, Paris 1927.

Bédier, Joseph, Les deux poèmes de la Folie Tristan, Paris, 1907.

Schurig, Arthur, Tristan und Isolde in der bretonischen Urgestalt, Dresden, 1923.

Reynaud, L., Les Origines de l'Influence française en Allemagne, Paris, 1913.

Bédier, Joseph, Le Roman de Tristan et Iseut, Paris.

Schmidt, K., Ist Gottfried von Strassburg Strassburger Stadtschreiber gewesen? Strasb. 1876.

Golther W, Tristan und Isolde in den Dichtungen des Mittelalters und der neueren Zeit, Leipzig 1907.

Schoepperle, G., Tristan and Isolt, Frankfurt & London, 1913.

Loth, J., Contributions à l'Etude des Romans de la Table Ronde, Paris, 1912.

## GENERAL (INTRODUCTORY) REMARKS.

The Literature on Gottfried of Strasbourg is slowly but steadily increasing and this proves the eminence of the poet in whom French "esprit" and German "Humor", gallic lucidity and German profoundness are most harmoniously united. It are these qualities that make him the continual object of literary enquiry and investigation and this clearly demonstrates which inexhaustible source of meditation he has been, still is and probably will remain for a long time to come.

In the present thesis I shall confine myself to examining the French Element as contained in "Tristan" but I deem it advisable, nevertheless, briefly to treat the French words and expressions we find in the works of his (Gottfried's) principal precursors and contemporaries, to summarize the most salient facts of his Life and to examine the essential qualities of his style.

The Language in which are written the works prior to Heinrich van Veldecke, whom, to some extent, we may call the reformer of Middle High German Literature, do not constitute, from a linguistic point of view, an organic, fully developed and independent dialect. A severe measure of verse, and a sonorous purity of rhyme are non existent, and it is thanks to the linguistic sensibility of the Dutchman van Veldecke, who writes in Middle High German, though strongly intermingled with Middle Low German (Niederdeutsch) that these two essential factors are no longer neglected. He introduces the French Rhyme into German poetry (Rudolf von Ems testifies that he "rehter rime alrêrste began" etc.) and inaugurates a new literary epoch which we may call the *Reproductive Epoch of Classic Middle High German Literature* i. e. the works produced by its chief representatives (Van Veldecke, Wolfram von Eschenbach, Hartmann von Aue, Gottfried von Strasbourg etc.) are for the greater part adaptions or translations from the French.

With the French subject a certain number of French words are gradually introduced into the Middle High German vocabulary, but this number remains within a reasonable limit except in the case of Gottfried of Strasbourg. The "Nibelungenlied" for instance contains comparatively few foreign words and expressions. Words like "Altar, natur, kirche, person," etc. had already been introduced into the German vocabulary with christianity and can thus not be taken into consideration; words like "kamer, kemenâte, venster, krone and porte" which we find in the Nibelungen, may be called foreign with a certain reserve; foreign, however, are "palas, sal, prüeven, tjoste, trunjun, samit, covertiure, schapel, buhurt, buhudieren, flojetieren, pfelle, pusûne, kolter, môraz, vloite, ferrans"; yet some of these words may have been known to some extent. With absolute certitude we may call "phert, permint and matraz" (derived from the Arabic al matrascha) foreign words. To this we may add geographical names as "Arabi, India, Libia, Maroch etc." In Wolfram's "Parcival" French words and expressions are rather seldom if we consider the French source of the poem. He uses them as indications of place: "terre de salvas, château Merveille, Montsalvas, fontaine salvage" etc., as direct locutions: "bon fils, cher fils, fils joli", "bel ami, fit li roi Gahmuret" etc., as appositions: "Kundrie la sorcière, Sigune la Duchesse, fils d'idol, Repanse de joie" etc. as verbs: tjostieren, courbettieren, etc., as substantives: "gabilot, rivier, seneschal, schevalier," and as adjectives as "clâr, fier" etc.; it must be borne in mind that words like: clâr, fein, preis etc. had probably just entered the vocabulary and were rather modern at the time. In any case French words are scarce in comparison with Gottfried. In Minnesang for instance, songs containing many French words were especially denoted as being "wälsche Lieder" as for example:

Als ich ging durch die Planüre,
Kam die schönste Kreatüre,
Schön wie Dido von Figüre,
Lud mich ein zur süssen aventiure.

Such songs were thus considered as "wälsch" i. e. un-German and Heinzel's assertion [1]) that the frequent use of French words was a manne-

[1]) Tristan und seine Quelle, Haupts Zeitschrift, 1869.

rism and in the taste of the time can, therefore, not be correct. In spite of the great productivity of the poets of the time the use of French words remains restricted; it must be borne in mind, furthermore, that if the use of such French words and expressions had been a mannerism it would imply that a great part of those persons constituting the readers or auditors of the poets had some knowledge of the French Language; this, however, was not the case for the educational level of the epoch was extraordinarily low. Let us recall that even the great Wolfram von Eschenbach could neither read nor write- and we will understand why the poets of those times generally repeat in German what they had said in either Latin or French. We will understand, as far as Gottfried is concerned, the continual game of questions and answers, the eternal: how, when and where — lieber man, "waz ist daz" and "waz ist diz"? "Curie", dê benie, waz ist curie, lieber man? (die Jagd) Is it not strange that Gottfried translates a simple sporting (hunting) term if we consider that these words are intended for comparatively educated men — knights and squires — who surely knew something about hunting; and if *they* did not understand these expressions how can we expect that the general crowd did. No., Gottfried translates because otherwise his auditors or readers would not understand him — and I venture to assert that his "Tristan" would never have obtained its immense popularity if he had not done so i. e. translated his French quotations. The poets of the time use French and Latin words in order to show their erudition, they translate them into their respective Language in order to be understood and it sometimes happens that they do not even translate their own quotations correctly. Anybody will admit that for the common man of those days Latin was an absolutely sealed book; consequently in poetical works Latin terms are generally translated into the Language familiar to everybody — in this case German — and therefore we read in Hartmann's "Der arme Heinrich":

Als uns die schrift hat geseit,
es spricht an einer stete dâ:
media vita
in morte sumus.

daz bediutet sich alsus,
daz wir in dem tode sweben,
so wir aller beste waenen leben.

The poet — at least the real poet — is always anxious to be fully understood and hence he translates such words of which he is sure beforehand that none or at least only few of his readers will understand them; of course he would not translate words known to every one — doing this he would only make himself ridiculous; on the other hand poets like to construct new forms or words from the existing vocabulary but they have generally an aversion from taking up new words as the employ of peculiar, strange or ultra modern words is against good taste in poetry.. the people constructs it sown vocabulary — the learned class uses new constructions with reluctance — even nowadays we see how averse the French Academy is to admitting new or foreign words into the Dictionary of the French Language. —

The German poet of to-day can use without any fear of being misunderstood expressions like: "Oriflamme, panier, passion, dauphin, dupieren, flanieren" etc. and none of his readers will ask: „flanieren", was ist das? In exactly the same manner for instance, the French poet can use: edelweiss, lied, etc. — and he is sure in advance that none of his readers will ask: "L'edelweiss, qu'est ce que c'est"? in any case he will not have to say, should he use the word in his writings: The edelweiss is an alpine flower, nor will the German poet be compelled in the interest of his work to give a long explanation of the word "dauphin" if he should use it. Should the German poet on the other hand use words like embetieren, cachieren etc. a great part of his readers would be compelled to look these expressions up in the dictionary. Resuming: I cannot see a mannerism in the frequent use Gottfried makes of French words. Firstly it is interdicted in good poetry by poetical feeling and instinct, secondly it would presuppose that at least a part of the readers would have some knowledge of French. This, however, was not the case in the time of Gottfried and — in order not to be like one crying in the wilderness he translates whereever he thinks to have reasons to do so.

As we have already said the adaptions from the French necessarily

implied the introduction of a certain number of French words but this number remained within a reasonable limit, none of the writers of the epoch uses them so lavishly as Gottfried does; if the number of French words is reasonable in Court Epic Poetry we may call it very moderate as far as Minnesang is concerned. In the remaining songs of the Emperor Heinrich, deceased in 1197, we do not find a single French word and in the songs of Walther von der Vogelweide and of Heinrich van Veldecke they are also comparatively rare. This holds also good for the Austrians Kürnberger (to whom Pfeiffer ascribes the Nibelungen) Dietmar von Aiste, Reinmar, Her Nithart, Uolrich von Lichtenstein, Walter von Mezze, Her(r) Rubin, Goltar, von Wildonje, der Suonecke, von Scharpfenberc, von Stadecke, Oswalt von Wolkenstein and for Spervogel, Werner von Tegernsee, Friedrich von Hausen, Heinrich von Morungen, Heinrich der Schreiber and Freidank — as far as their works have been accessible to me. The same may be said about the popular songs of the medieval ages.

## GOTTFRIED'S STYLE.

As far as Gottfried's style is concerned it is of such liquidity and grace that, if we compare it to that of Wolfram and Hartman, it is difficult to imagine that we have to do with contemporaries. If his two great rivals surpass him in loftiness and vastness, he overshadows them by the buoyancy and brilliance of his spirited verses, by the wonderful harmony of contents and form and the facility with which he masters the Language; in this respect his superiority is incontestable. From a stylistic point of view Gotfried was for his time what Nietzsche and Heine have been for theirs. For him the Language is liquid gold of which he shapes his wonderful verses; he creates new forms and expressions, forms new verbs etc. in short — wields the Language as no one had ever done before and as nobody did but a long time afterwards. His verses are bewitching, of incredible tenderness and yet vigorous and manly. The action of "Tristan" is never slackened by phantastical monstruosity: bright and smiling pictures, enchanting descriptions, graceful jocundity, interwoven with serious contemplations about Love and Life — that is Tristan. The clumsy, the dreadful, the awe inspiring which we so frequently find in the works of his contemporaries is banished from his Poem; it is the joyful affirmation of Life which, after periods of literary pessimism and puritanism, will always find some powerful representative. The principle of Goethe:

Aus dieser Erde quillen meine Freuden,
Und diese Sonne scheinet meinen Leiden".

was also Gottfried's conception of Life:

„der werlt wil ich gewerldet wesen,
mit ihr verderben oder genesen".

His poem glorifies earthly love — that love, which consumes man, but which nevertheless makes him the equal of Gods. He is the champion of all the joys the world can give; he is worldly minded and combats clumsiness of style and obscurity of thought, attacks the "moralizing unknown", Wolfram von Eschenbach, and appreciates as an unenvious ungrudging great poet the merits of others in the most beautiful and praiseworthy manner (Schwertleite). He indulges in rethoric and stylistic forms most suitable for the description of a passion and in glittering and brilliant Language he creates a poem destined to outlast the ages and this on account of its bi-spirituality (or poly-spirituality) which, from a national point of view may perhaps encroach upon a poet's popularity but which, from a purely literary standpoint, can only increase it. [1]) No wonder that this merry worldling fully felt the wrath of certain German critics and that puritans attacked him in about the same manner as they did Molière and Heine. Take any history of German Literature and the judgment about him will be nearly the same. In the first place one reproaches him the frequent use he makes of French expressions and terms and especially the Swiss Howald (in his History of German Literature) rages that he calls his country "Allemanje" without considering that geographical notions were very confuse and little fixed at the time, that linguistic and national antagonism were less pronounced, that Gottfried was not guided by national but by purely artistic principles and that where he uses the word "Allemanje" it is perfectly well in its place:

> Norwaegen, Irlandaeren,
> Allemanjen, Schotten unde Tenen. etc. 3700.

To this must be added the reproof that they make him on account of the matter of the poem itself and the manner in which he treats it. This peremptory and dogmatic judgment has remained the same for about one century, at least in works which treat German Literature synoptically. In 1846 Bernhard Hüppe in his History of German Literature treats him (leniently) in the following manner: "Er stattete

[1]) By poly-spirituality I understand spirituality beyond the limits of specific nationalism i. e. thoughts expressed by a mind unencumbered by the more restricted sentiments, ideas, feelings and customs of a larger or smaller community.

die Poesie des sinnlichen Lebensgenusses mit einem Glanz der Sprache und einer gemütlichen Tiefe aus, die wir bewundern müssen, aber nicht billigen dürfen, während Wolfram in Parzival alle Kraft seines Geistes an die Darstellung der höchsten sittlichen Ideale setzt". In 1861 we read in the "Bibliothek der deutschen Klassiker der Hohenstaufenzeit": "Die bezeichneten Vorzüge hat Gotfried noch Niemand bestritten, wohl aber hat er wegen der Unsittlichkeit des Stoffes an sich als einer schamlosen Verhöhnung der Gattentreue von seiten der Sitteneiferer schwere Vorwürfe erfahren". This is indulgent if compared with the judgment of the notorious Howald who dogmatizes Gottfried in the severest manner. In his History of German Literature (Geschichte der deutschen Literatur, Konstanz 1903) the following severe judgment is passed on him (in some concordance with Scherer)" Ein Bürgerlicher wird er gewesen sein, denn er wird Meister, nicht Herr geheissen. Aber edelmännisch will er sich geben. Er kennt den Ovid und benützt ihn gern und bis zum Ueberdruss häufig schaltet er französische Wörter in den leichten Fuss seiner Verse ein, ja, sein deutsches Vaterland nennt er „Allemanje". Was bot er der Welt denn? Eine Dichtung, die bei verwandten Naturen bis auf den heutigen Tag immer Anklang fand, die berühmte Geschichte von Tristan und Isolde, einem Franzosen nacherzählt.... eine Verherrlichung sträflichen Ehebruchs.... fürchte der Leser aber nicht, das Werk, das übrigens der Dichter nicht selbst vollenden konnte, werde uns solange bannen, wie es der Parzival tat. The historian Holzwarth is not less severe and harsh. In 1879 he writes in his „Weltgeschichte", Band 4: „die schmähliche Verhöhnung der Gattentreue ist der Gegenstand des Gedichtes „Tristan und Isolde".... das Gedicht verherrlicht nicht nur jene irdische Liebesglut, die den Menschen in seinen innersten und besten Elementen aufzehrt und sich selbst als einzigen Lebensinhalt darstellt, sondern schreitet auch achtlos hinweg über göttliches und menschliches Gesetz, über Scham und Sitte, Tugend und Ehre; denn wenn auch die Entstehung der Liebe auf den Minnetrank zurückgeführt und dadurch die Schuld auf das Geschick gewälzt wird, so ist doch nirgends von einem Kampf zwischen Liebe und Pflicht die Rede: „unbekümmert um den schmachvollen Verrat, der an König Marke begangen wird, schwelgen Tristan und Isolde in ihrem Liebestaumel". In this manner

quite a number of Historians and Historians of Literature judge Gottfried, whom Bechstein, Piquet and Bédier, with fullest reason call one the greatest German poet of the middle-ages. This is no longer critique, but hatred or an antagonism or antipathy, which I should call the instinctive disinclination of "uni-spirituality" (one-mindeness) to "poy-spirituality, the bias of one-sidedness against many-sidedness, or psychologically explainable antigeniality, if directed by great against great. [1]) To this we may add objective criticism: Scherer, Geschichte der Deutschen Literatur 1917, treats him pretty fairly but also makes him the reproach of having called Germany "Allemagne". In the excellent History of German Literature by Waldemar Oehlke (1919) he is treated objectively, but in a few words only. A very favourable opinion is expressed by the „Brockhaus Realenzyclopädie", 1827, thus exactly one hunderd years ago: "In Anmut, Lieblichkeit, Heiterkeit und Leichtigkeit der Darstellung ist Gottfrieds Werk einzig in der altdeutschen Literatur". Full appreciation he only finds in special studies and dissertations: Heinzel, Bechstein, Herz, Piquet, Bédier, Röttiger, Hoepffner etc.. But all this proves the greatness of the man and poet

---

[1]) Antigeniality: Gottfried against Wolfram, Voltaire against Shakespeare, Rousseau against Molière, Nietzsche against Schiller (Moraltrompeter von Säckingen) and Dante (Hyäne auf den Gräbern) Heine against Platen etc. Mono-spirituality against poly-spirituality: generally critics against authors: Quaterly Review against Keats, Menzel contra Goethe, Bartels against Heine. etc.

## GOTTFRIED'S PERSONALITY.

We know nothing positive about Gottfried's Life; in my opinion it is not even certain that he was born at Strasbourg. The simple fact that he is called Gottfried of Strasbourg is no proof that he was born in this town, for he may have come there as a child or youth. In Strasbourg chronicles documents we find nothing about him and the supposition that he might been town clerk of Strasbourg „rodelarius or notarius", because in a document of King Philipp, dated June 18th 1207, mntion is made of a certain Godefredus, "rodelarius" de Argentina„ is untenable since Schmidt [1]) has proved Rodelarius to be Zidelarius. Bechstein [2]) is even inclined to believe, on account of the inner satisfaction and jocundity of Gottfried's style, that the poet was probably a man in office. This argument, however, is very futile: Röttiger takes Thomas for a clergyman and Chrestien de Troyes is thought to have been a "clerc" and a "King-at-arms" [3]) In my opinion the style of Tristan is anything but official. Would anyone read the Minister of State in these lines of Goethe?

„Ein garstig Lied, pfui! ein politisch Lied,
Ein leidig Lied! dankt Gott mit jedem Morgen,
Dass ihr nicht braucht für's Röm'sche Reich zu sorgen!
Ich halt es wenigstens für reichlichen Gewinn,
Dass ich nicht Kaiser oder Kanzler bin." etc.

Nothing is more difficult than to determine the poet's profession by his works. Was not Shakespeare on account of his universal knowledge taken in turn for an actor, for a solicitor, for a printer and for a member of the medical profession? Would anyone read the Staff Surgeon in Schiller's ballads? Bechstein's hypothesis must be dismissed

[1]) Schmidt, C.: Ist Gottfried von Strassburg, der Dichter, Strassburger Stadtsdreiber gewesen? Strassb. 1876.

[2]) Reinhold Bechstein, Gottfrieds' von Strassburg Tristan I, Einleitung.

[3]) Golther, in Tristan und Isolde in den Dichtungen des Mittelalters und der neuen Zeit, page 140, goes so far as seriously to pretend: "Thomas war ohne persönliche Erfahrung in Liebessachen" (sic!).

as being unfounded and we must resign ourselves to the fact that Gottfried's biography consists of a few words only, namely of the scarce information we can gather from the works of his contemporaries or immediate successors. In the first place Rudolf von Ems:

„Oder haetet iuch ergeben
meister Gôtfrides kunst
von Strasburc; haetet ir des gunst
sô wol sô Tristan unde Isôt." (Wilhelm)

secondly he refers to him in "Alexander":

„wie guetet ez der guôten guot,
der hôchgemuoten hôhen muot:
daz stiez der wise Gôtfrit
von Strasburc, der nie valschen tritt
mit valsche in siner rede getrat;
wie ist ebensleht gesat
sin funt, wie ist sin sin sô rich!
wie ist sô gar meisterlich
sin Tristan.

and finally in the same poem:

„der wise meister Gôtfrit sanc,
das veste sî bloede unde krank".

To the we may add his two continuators; in the first place Ulrich von Tuerheim, who, on the desire expressed by his protector Schenk Konrad von Winterstetten (died about 1243) completed Tristan and who beginning his task, says of Gottfried:

„Uns ist ein schade grôz geschehen:
dez mac diz maere ist in nôt
sit meister Gotfrit ist tôt,
der dizes búoches begunde." etc.,

and then, much later, his second continuer, Heinrich van Freiberg:

„und meisterlich berichtet
sin herre, meister Gôtfrit
von Strasburc, der sô manegen snit
spéhen unde richen
schon unde meisterlichen". etc.

He is furthermore mentioned by Konrad von Würzburg in the middle of the 13th century as "von Strazburc Meister Gôtfrit" and in Konrad von Stoffel's epic poem "Gauriel von Montaval" as "Meister Gôtfrit". Many years later when it is already difficult to say anything definite about him, he is mentined in the 15th century, in the "Letter of Honour of German Poetry": "von Strassburg Gotfrit Tristram hat besachet" (here Strasburc is already Strassburg and Tristan is Tristram). Finally we find his name again in Fürterer's poem of the Round Table: "von Straspurg her Gottfrides Kunst" and with this the positive knowledge of his life is exhausted. Thus — we have heen told that Meister Gottfried of Strasbourg was a great poet, that he lived and died, and that his death was a grievous loss for German Literature; but all this we would have known and believed without baving been told so. For what do all these statements prove? In my opinion, nothing at all. They do not even solve the problem whether Gottfried was "meister" or "her". If Ulrich von Türheim and Heinrich von Freiburg call him "meister", Fürterer calls him "her". It is, furthermore, doubtful, whether the title "meister" was not higher than that of "her"; there are so many "herren" in medieval German poetry and so few "meister" which, in my opinion, may be ascribed to the fact that the title of "her" was either inherited or conferred whereas the title of "meister" had to be acquired. Persons excelling in their profession were given the title of "meister"; artisans (gold- and silversmiths) as well as painters and poets; but especially members of the legal profession were called so (also medical men; Shakespeare uses the expression: Master Doctor). In France and the Netherlands lawyers and solicitors are still addressed as "maître" and "Meester" respectively. In short: in a certain sense it stands above the appelation "her", for persons of eminent rank, power or authority, having others under their controll, are called: Meister, master, maître, meester, magister. In England for instance the Master of the Rolls guards the great seal of Empire (a legal occupation or function) and the Master of the Horse is third in rank at the British court only (also the magister equitum of the Romans had considerable privileges). Whatever and however the case may be the title of meister or master was a very important one in the Middle Ages. Now one might be tempted to

deduct from the first examples that Gottfried was a member of the legal profession or the guild of lawyers, but no knowledge of law can be gathered from his work; on the other hand he develops an immense stock of general knowledge in Tristan especially of classic philology and mythology so that we may suppose with some reason that he was a "magister artium". Especially in the "Schwertleite" there are profound reflections on contemporary German Literature and he shows himself at the same time so well versed in Greek History and Letters that, compared with other German poets or the epoch his knowledge may rightly be called extraordinary. He refers to "Elikone, Apolle, Vulkan and Pegasus" to the "Camênen and Sirenen", to Orpheus and to "Cassander, die Trôjerinne", in short shows himself to be so thoroughly acquainted with Classic Literature, that we have all reasons to suppose to have to do with a scholar and subsequently with a Master of Arts. *But now we are coming to a very important point.* The first degrees of Master of Arts, (maître ès arts), were conferred by the University of Paris, the first German Universities not being founded before 1348 (Prague) and 1365 (Vienna) respectively, thus after the death of Gottfried. The University of Paris, however, existed already before the birth of Gottfried, one of its most celebrated teachers was Abailard. (to this I shall refer later on). Of the other existing Universities Salerno and Montpellier were Schools of Medicine and Bologna and Padua Schools of Law and the only degree they granted was that of Doctor. *From this it results with absolute certainty* that, if Gottfried was Master in the sense of Master of Arts (Magister artium) he must have been in Paris, for this was the only place where he could obtain the title. His absolute mastery of the French Language corroberates this assumption; and — if he was in Paris, he is sure to have made the acquaintance of some eminent Frenchmen, of this there can be no doubt: It is not impossible that he has known Chretien de Troyes personally; why should he not have paid this venerable man a visit either on his journey to or from Paris? And even — had Gottfried not been in Paris, he may, nevertheless, have undertaken a pilgrimage to Troyes, considering the comparatively short distance between the two places. I shall have the opportunity in the course of the present observations, to refer once more to this possibility.

# THOMAS AND THE MONK ROBERT.

Piquet says in the introduction to his work "L'originalité de Gotfried de Strasbourg": "on sait cependant depuis longtemps que Gotfried n'a pas imaginé la matière de son poème". Indeed this we know and we have know it for fully seven hundred years for Gottfried has never tried to conceal his foreign source, on the contrary, he has rather boasted of it. But because he das done this and because in the "Eingang" and at various other places he refers to Thomas — critics mean, that for this reason they are also bound to stick to Thomas. For the simple reason that Gottfried wrote of him that he

„der aventiure meister was
und an britûnschen buochen las"

they forget that Gottfried says of himself:

„begunde ich sére suochen
in bei der lande buochen
walschen und latinen. etc.

If Gottfried did not make a secret of his foreign source, perhaps in the interest of his poem, he was possibly interested in concealing his exact source. [1]) Who was Thomas? Of him we know still less than about Gottfried i.e. about nothing. Röttiger supposes him to have been a monk or clergyman and G. Paris thinks that he was of English nationality on account of the difference of spirit between his and French works of the epoch. There may possibly be some truth in the first supposition because the (Norwegian) Monk Robert is thought to have translated his poem into Norwegian for King Hakon, and a monk would naturally like to translate a monk. The second hypothesis is less probable: why should an English monk (I do not say Norman) write

[1]) Wolfram von Eschenbach in "Parzival" purposely hides his source, refers to a mysteriuos Kyot, in order that nobody might know that he had copied Chrestien, who is only once mentioned, nearly at the end.

in French just at the time when English poetry began to develop, when the example given by Alfred the the Great in about 885 (translation into English of Bede's History of England etc.) to write in English, was followed by the majority of writers; and then it is a well known fact that if ecclesiastics wrote in a foreign Language it was generally in Latin; why then should Thomas have written in French? Poets, however, if not writing in their native tongue would generally write in Provençal as did the German Emperor Frederick I. Barbarossa, and the English King Richard I. Lion-heart; these cases, however, were exceptional; it must be borne in mind that French was not then the widely written and spoken Language. There is also no certainly about the time when Thomas wrote. Paris [1]) thinks between 1160 and 1170 Bédier [2]) 1160 and Röttiger puts it between 1125 and 1140. [3]) I am more inclined to believe G. Paris and Bédier; not because they prove anything definite, the problem remains unsolved, and not because that in a controversy about Old French Literature it would only be fair to give the Frenchman the "benefit of the doubt" — but because there are reasons to believe that Thomas was a contemporary of Chrétien as also believed by Wendelin Foerster, Wilmotte, etc.

In his work Piquet writes furthermore on page 5. "Les fragments de Thomas utilisés dans le poème allemend sont d'un prix inestimable" and on page 8.: "Sir Tristrem est d'une faible utilité pour la reconstruction du poème. L'auteur s'est bien inspiré de Thomas, mais il a considérablement abrégé son texte, et s'est souvent livré à son imagination".

Piquet continues: "il n'est pas de même de la version scandinave". This, in my opinion, is rather misleading: as beforesaid, there are only 100 + 52 Thomas verses of the remaining 3000. which we can compare with Gottfried's work, namely nearly at the and of Gottfried's Tristan i.e. Thomas sets in where Gottfried ends; the Thomas-Gottfried comparison can only begin with verse 18197 i. e. nearly end of Gottfried and beginning of Thomas fragment.

And since we only possess Thomas *fragments* it is impossible to say whether the Scandinavian or English translation comes nearer to the

---

[1]) Romania, pag. 430.
[2]) Bédier, II, 46.
[3]) Der Tristan des Thomas, pag. 56.

original of Thomas as a comparison with a complete Thomasian text is impossible. Subsequently we can only say anything positive as far as these 152 verses are concerned, the rest is utter hypothesis and supposition. Piquet supposes Robert te have made mistakes in his translation. This is very likely, but I do not think that he (Robert) was unable to distinguish for instance "seignur" from "pleisir" as Piquet believes. In the first place Robert was a monk and as such the word „seignur" will have been one of the first French words he learned and secondly is the meaning of the two words so different that the reproach of ignorance would be rather bold. It is possible but not certain that the Robertian text is a translation of Thomas.

Novati calls Robert an "Epitomatore" because he has apparently sometimes abridged the text of Thomas, but we must not forget that there also passages in Robert's work which we do not find in the work of Thomas or which may not have been in it. Thus Robert is supposed to have lengthened and shortened the text and I do not think that anyone will deny that *Robert thought the passages he added to be better than those he left out.* In my opinion Robert is nothing but a recorder a "jongleur de la plume" who compiled his work from the various Tristan texts that were within his reach. His translation of Tristan stands in about the same relation to that of Gottfried as Holinsheds Chronicles to the master works of Shakespeare, as the play "True Chronicle of King Leir and his 3 daugthers", written in about 1603, to Shakespeare's "King Lear". There is necessarily some similarity of action but the piece has as little of Shakespeare's mind as Robert has of Gottfried's. To him (Robert) we may apply the words of Goethe:

„Dann hat er die Teile in seiner Hand,
Fehlt leider nur das geistige Band.".

The differences between Saga and Gottfried are very great; perhaps less striking in action than in poetical description. Piquet himself is forced to admit that Thomas does not excel as a master of rustic delineation. On page 109 of his "Originalité" he says: "Gottfried est plus abondant que Robert, mais le bon moine a pu abréger". This is no argument! Robert may have abridged and he may have enlarged for Piquet is bound to confess on the same page, referring to verses

3155-89, "aucun moyen to contrôle ne permet cependant quel est l'auteur de cette donnée (arrival at Tintajoël); as soon as there is more in Robert than in Gottfried, it is easy to say: the monk has added something and Gottfried has left something out; and as soon as there is something in Gottfried which is missing in Robert, it is very simple to say: "the monk has abridged". For the simple possibility [1]) that there was an introduction in the Thomas version Piquet ascribes a part of the "Eingang" to Thomas though no one can possibly contest that just the Eingang is purely and wholly Gottfredian. Piquet's arguments in favour of Thomas (Saga) generally commence by: "il est vraisemblable, il est invraisemblable, il semble, il ne semble pas, il paraît" etc. But what is, that is the question! Where is the positive, where the concrete? Let us take another example (page 99) „Le costume des pélerins que rencontre Tristan est décrit par Gottfried de façon pittoresque. Malheureusement aucun critère n'autorise à attribuer ce joli passage au poète allemand. Ni la Saga ni Sir Tristrem n'offrent trace, il est vrai, d'un portrait des „saintes gens". Mais les nombreuses mutilations de ces deux textes nous font un devoir de ne pas exiper de leur silence". So it seems that there must be resemblance at any price i. e. if there is none it has to be constructed.

As to Thomas I think it wrong to overrate him as G. Paris does, though his Tristan is certainly of great and lasting literary value. In my opinion a comparison of the texts Gottfried-Thomas-Robert cannot solve the problem whether Gottfried used Thomas as a model or not. In order to correborate my assertion I have taken the following passages from Piqut's book:

| Thomas (Cambridge Fragment) | Gottfried. |
|---|---|
| „En ce bras Yseut la reine | „wip unde neven die vander |
| Bien cuidoient estre a seür." | mit armen zuo ein ander |
| 1-2. | geflohten nâhe und ange |
| | ir wange an sînem wange |
| | ir munt an sînem munde." |
| | 18199-204. |

[1]) Le milz ai dit a mun poeir,
E dit ai tute la verur,
Si cum jo pramis al primur. Bédier, Thomas I, 3132-34.

I do not see any resemblence in these verses, though I confess that the sight is the same, i. e.: somebody surprises his wife in the arms of another man. Whether the betrayed husband is a workman or a King makes no difference to Gottfried. For him a king does not surprise an adulterous Queen, but a husband his wife and what affects him most is — that his rival is at the same time his nephew. "Wip unde neven die vander" by this simple but striking statement the superior art of Gottfried is clearly demonstrated.

| | |
|---|---|
| Quant il endormis les trouverent. | Tristan und diu künigin |
| 7. | die sliefen harte souze. |
| | (i'ne weiz, nâch was unmouze) |
| | 18216-18. |

Thomas simply states what everyone knows about the Saga whereas Gottfried describes in the most artful and waggish manner. The line: „i'ne weiz, nâch was unmuoze" imparts poetical value and charm to the scene.

| | |
|---|---|
| Amie Yseut, car esvelliez. | Isôt wachet, armes wip! |
| 18. | wachet, herzekünigin. |
| | 18258-59. |

Here it strikes me as being very strange that Gottfried, who generally uses so many French exclamations and interjections, does not employ: "Amie Yseult". This would have well suited the rythm of the verse for instance in placing it thus: "Yseut amie, armes wip, wachet herzekünigin".

| | |
|---|---|
| Je m'en voil aler, bele amie". | „herzefrouwe, schoene Isôt, |
| 24. | nu müeze wir uns scheiden". |
| | 18270-71. |

Here the dry prosaical statement of Thomas is turned into beautifu! poetry by Gottfried. „Nu müeze wir uns scheiden" has ever since remained the leitmotiv of the popular German Lied. The exclamation „bele amie" is missing in the Gottfridian verses.

Li rois a veu quanque avon fait. „min herre der stuont obe uns hie:
20. er sach uns beide, und ich sach in.
18261-62.

Is it necessary to say that there is *no* concordance!

Je n'os dame, plus attendre dûze amie, bele Isôt,
Or me baisiés au congié prendre." gebietet mir und küsset mich
35-36. 18288-89.

No concordance and similarity whatever; striking that Gottfried uses the compellation „dûze amie, bele Isôt" which is not in the Thomas text; this is the stranger as we have strong reasons to suppose that Gottfried would have taken over any direct address had he seen it in the original before him. So Gottfried uses French exclamations which are not in Thomas who in turn employs some which we would seek in vain in Gottfried.

Nequedent cest anel prenes, „und nemet hin diz vingerlin
Pour m'amor, amis le gardés. daz lât ein urkunde sîn
51. der triuwen unde der minne'
18311-13.

There is no poetical concordance and similarity. Thomas states a fact which has needs to be in the action, Gottfried, however, describes in the most sublime poetical style. The beautiful turning „das lât ein urkunde sîn der triuwen unde der minne" imparts the literary value. The Thomasian wording "por m'amor, amis, le gardés" sounds poor and unpoetical compared to Gottfried.

The Fragment Sneyd can in my opinion just as little throw light upon the source of Gottfried.

| Fragment Sneyd. | Gottfried. |
|---|---|
| Sis corages mue sovent, | „und aber dô was naht unde tac |
| E pense mult diversement | gedenkende unde trahtende |
| Cum changer puisse sun voleir, | und angeslichen ahtende |
| Quant sun desir ne puit aveir." | umbe sîn leben und umbe sich" |
| 53-56. | 19424-27. |

Sublime poetry on both sides — but no similarity; the Gottfredian turning "ume sîn leben und umbe sich" is profoundly charming. "umbe sîn leben" — the beloved person, "umbe sich" — own Life — of secondary importance.

E dit dunc; Ysolt, bele amie,
Mult est diverse notre vie:
La vostre amur tant se desevre
Qu'ele n'est fors pur mei decevre."
57-60.

„â, süeze amie, liebe Isôt
diz leben ist unter uns beiden
alze sêre gescheiden.
19480-82.

In these verses the poetical power of Thomas is perhaps superior; in the fragment Sneyd Yseult is called Ysolt as in the Turin fragment and Folie Tristan (Oxford) against Ysiaut (Bern Fragment) whereas Gottfried adheres to Isôt, Isôte; the French turning "Ysolt, bele amie" is missing in Gottfried who says: "süeze amie" It is, however, *most striking* that two of the most beautiful verses of the whole Tristan and which are just in that part of the poem we can compare, are missing in Thomas, namely the tender lines:

„Isôt ma drüe, Isôt m'amie,
En vûs ma mort, en vûs ma vie". [1])

From the above I suppose we can conclude with sufficient reason that there cannot be question of adaption in the general sense of the word; the last example makes me think that Gottfried may perhaps not even have known the complete Thomas text.

But since Bossert has discovered in 1865 [1]) that a small piece at the end of Gottfried's poem is somewhat identical with the corresponding portion of Thomas — it has become mere mannerism to construct resemblance Gottfried — Thomas at any price. In my opinion the whole controversy as to Gottfried's originality is absolutely superfluous, for the great Strasbourger has fully proved his originality

[1]) The verses: La bele raïne, s'amie
En cui est sa morte e sa vie, Bédier Thomas, I, 1061-62.
(La salle aux Images).
are certainly missing the poetical charm of the Gottfredian lines.

[1]) Bossert, A. Tristan et Iseut, poème de Gotfried de Strasbourg comparé à d'autres poèmes sur le même sujet (Paris, 1865).

not only in "der Eingang" and "die Schwertleite", but in nearly all chapters of his master-work. A poet who writes verses as contained in "Eingang" and "Schwertleite' will never be a simple translator. I have taken from the comparisons contained in Piquet, those verses which show the greatest similarity and I suppose that anyone will readily agree that the resemblence is very slight indeed. Besides the total difference of measure, the analogy of action is so minimal that it is hardly worth mentioning. Such similarity must needs be in any two works treating the same subject, that is inevitable; for, if this were not permitted, if this were considered translating or adapting from a foreign source — it would mean the curtailment of epic and dramatic poetry, and the predominance or prevalence of lyricism, it would mean that only one poet could write on a certain subject and that if another one did the same in a much superior manner i. e. would turn the barren facts of the first into sublime and enchanting poetry, he would run the risk of being called a mere adapter. In this case Shakespeare would belong to this class of poets for not having invented the plot of a single of his plays, not Schiller would be the author of Wallenstein, but the Duke of Friedland, Piccolomini and Buttler would have written it themselves, not Heine but Brentano would be the outhor of the most celebrated German song: die Lorelei; the rhymster of the Puppenspiel ',Faust" would obfuscate the fame of Goethe, for who can deny, that there is, in the beginning, a certain similarity between the „Puppenspiel" and Goethe's immortal Master work?

From the comparison of the texts Gottfried-Thomas we have seen that from a purely poetical point of view Gottfried is in no way dependent on Thomas and incomprehensible is the opinion expressed by G. Paris; [1]) "s'il (Gottfried) a enchéri sur l'élégance et la courtoisie de celui-ci (Thomas), il ne paraît pas avoir pénétré plus profondement ou même aussi profondement que lui dans le coeur de ses personnages — et je ne crois pas qu'il eût donné à ces douloureux et poétiques épisodes de la fin du poème la grâce et l'émotion dont Thomas a su les pénétrer". I have indicated the beautiful lines non-existent in Thomas, and I thin kthat Wilmotte's opinion about Thomas comes nearer to the mark: "mais qui nous prouve que Thomas qui a pillé Wace

[1]) Tristan et Iseut, page 36.

sans vergogne n'ait pas fait autant de Chrétien? Ce qui plaide le plus contre lui (Thomas) c'est l'omission, chez lui, de ce délicieux trait du cheveu d'or d'Yseut apporté en Cornouailles par l'hirondelle. Ce trait est dans Cligés et, selon toute vraisemblance, il figurait dans le Tristan du même auteur".

Indeed in "Cligés" we find the delicious feature of the golden hair which Soredamors, niece of King Arthur, has put under the gold and silver embroidery of the shirt given to Alexander by Queen Guenievre.

Soredamors de leus au leus,
S'avoit antrecosu par leus
Les l'or de son chief un chevol
Et as deus manches et au col,
Por savoir et por esprover,
Se ja porroit home trover. (Cligés, 1159-1164.)

(We must bear in mind, however, that Gottfried rejects the golden hair version).

We may, furthermore, oppose Hoepffner's opinion to that of Paris: "Il a mis dans la vieille légende quelque chose que Thomas n'avait pas su lui donner. Thomas, un clerc sans doute, reste froid et compassé; il raisonne, il subtilise; d'un effort pénible et consciencieux il dissèque les sentiments de ses héros plutôt qu'il ne les fait vivre. Chez Gottfried, au contraire, c'est la vie et la lumière. Il se meut avec une aisance étonnante dans le monde qu'il évoque. Combien ses personnages sont vivants" [1]) etc. etc. "This judgment, in my opinion, hits the right nail on the head and make sophistical research as to Gottfried's originality absolutely superfluous and unnecessary. We know that the great Strasbourger is original; what is necessary is to see who inspired him, who taught him the "ars poetica" as far as it is possible to teach it, who roused his slumberimg talents.

In any case Gottfried has not pillaged Thomas and as to the remarks of G. Paris one might ask: *Was* the beginning of the Thomasian poem so beautiful and lovely as that of Gottfried actually *is*. I confess there are certain analogies, that cannot be otherwise especially in the

[1]) Hoepffner, Ernest, Les Influences Littéraires de la France sur les Lettres en Alsace. p. 10, Strasbourg 1925.

the case of two poets like Gottfried and Thomas, but such analogy must exist in any works treating the same subject; and they do exist in all Tristan texts whether of Thomas, Gottfried, Béroul, Eilhard and the manyfold medieval compositions. In my opinion each of these works has to be considered separately as being the product of a more or less powerful poetical mind; if two painters paint a horse, each will represent it in his own style and manner; but we are sure beforehand that they will give it a head, a mane, 4 legs and a tail — There is a Tristan of Thomas, Béroul, Gottfried etc. just as well as there is a Doctor Faustus of Marlowe, a German Puppenspiel "Faust" and a Faust by Goethe. Of course I do not deny that a good part of Gottfried's Tristan may be a genial adaptation from the French, on the contrary, I am fully convinced it is; but in my opinion not only from that of Thomas, as far as can be judged.

Bédier is very cautions in his criticism concerning Thomas — Gottfried — his mission consists in reconstructing the Thomas text and not in determinung Gottfried's originality. On page 76-79, Thomas II, he says as to Gottfried-Saga: "Mais la Saga est là: si on la lit concurremment avec le Tristan und Isolde, on est, dès d'abord, frappé d'un parallélisme qui commence avec le poème allemand, se prolonge, se soutient, ne finit qu'avec lui; pas un récit de Thomas n'a été sacrifié pas un a été même *déplacé* pas un n'a été ajouté; rien que des inventions secondaires, ou des variantes de simple mise en scène. .....et ces milliers de vers de Gottfried sont donc de pures et simples traductions de milliers de vers de Thomas." Bédier then continues: "Il est un créateur, pourtant..... C'est dans les parties imitées elles-mêmes qu'il faut observer les miracles de son activité créatrice. Voyez ces chapitres que nous mettons en regard du texte de la Saga..... En ce chapitres mêmes, remarquez les incessantes interventions de Gottfried, l'art prestigieux de ses retouches..... grâce à un système different de valeurs, ces vers traduits semblent être, *sont en effet, des créations toutes neuves*". So M. Bédier is, in a certain sense, contradicting his own assertion; first he says: „ces milliers de vers de Gottfried sont donc de pures et simples traductions de milliers de vers de Thomas" and then, seeing that "diese Behauptung auf sehr schwachen Beinen steht", he prudently adds: „Ces vers semblent

être, sont en effet, des créations toutes neuves", thus using about the same ambiguous terms as Piquet does in his "Originality". Now if two authorities like Piquet and Bédier set forth such arguments we may rightly say that the whole Thomas-Gottfried theory is very badly substantiated and has something of the Bacon-Shakespeare theory. We have never heard that a simple translator who faithfully follows his model or text has made a new and better work of the work he translated. The question is simply this: Too much importance is attached to the frame of the poem i. e. the plot, the action and the order of action than to the poem itself. Do we — in celebrated portraits — admire art and genius of the painter — or do we admire the persons represented, because they have lent their face as a model? I have sufficiently exposed my views as to action and I pretend: *Gottfried was a very bad translator* and that for the simple reason because *he was so great a poet*. We must not forget that in the middle-ages it was general custom strictly to adhere to the original plot, and the Tristan plot is about the same in all Tristan versions. Heinrich van Veldecke, Wolfram, Hartmann, Eilhardt etc. follow their text much more closely than Gottfried does because they are not gifted in the same degree with that „miracle de son activité créatrice" to which Bédier so justly refers. Let us once more recall that we can only compare 100 + 52 = 152 Gottfredian verses with those of Thomas. "Il est resté inachevé" (Tristan und Isolde). Bédier writes "et s'interrompt au vers 19552, à la scène où Tristan delibère, s'il épousera Isolt aux Blanches Mains; c'est précisément à cette scène (un fragment de cinquante-deux vers mis à part) que commencent les fragments conservés du poème de Thomas, en sorte que la comparaison directe de Gottfried et de son modèle ne peut porter que sur une centaine de vers (Bédier, Thomas, I, 11). Consequently the Gottfried-Thomas problem must remain hypothecical. As to the order of action the following: Piquet says in the Chapter: "Rual Retrouve Tristan", page 116: "Gottfried a modifié l'ordre du recit". Who can prove this? On the contrary, I think it rather arbitrary that Bédier changes the order of the Gottfredian action to make them conform to Saga; so for instance in "Les Marchands de Norvège", Bédier Thomas I, in Gottfried "die Entführung", the voyage

Rual undertakes in quest of Tristan (in Gottfried, "ein Wiedersehen") is immediately added, thus passing over 2 chapters in Gottfried namely "die Jagd" and "der junge Künstler" representing a total of about 1000 verses, for the Gottfredian order is: "Die Entführung, die Jagd, ein Wiedersehen." I call this reconstruction "a tout prix". Bédier has thus evidently forgotten what he said in Thomas II (page 76-79) „pas un (récit) n'a été même déplacé". Furthermore: is it absolutely sure that the different fragments: Cambridge, Sneyd, Turin and Strasbourg belong together, that they form a unit? Is it not strange that in the Cambridge fragment we read: Tristan — Yseut and in the connecting Sneyd I fragment: Ysolt — Tristran or Tristrans!

Of Saga we only possess one (Icelandic) 17th century manuscript and some fragments dating from 15th century.

## BEROX. (BÉROUL).

In comparison to Gottfried's Tristan the work of Béroul reads like versified prose though it much surpasses Eilhard's composition. We find in Béroul such analogy with Gottfried as we can beforehand expect to meet. There is some vigorous versification in Berox but taken as a whole the work seems to be without a fixed plan that the opinion expressed by various experts that it should have been composed by several writers has some „raison d'être". I think that the following verses of Béroul are as much alike to those of Gottfried as the Thomasian ones are; but since Gottfried has never referred to Berox he has not in the same degree attracted the attention if literary investigation i. e. he has not been so closely compared with Gottfried, which, I admit, would also not have advanced matters.

| Beroul. | Gottfried. |
|---|---|
| Li rois qui sus en l'arbre éstoit | der trûrige Marke, |
| Ou l'ensenble bien veüe | der ûf dem boume dâ saz |
| Et la raison tote entendue. | der betrürete aber daz, |
| Itel pitié au cor li prist | und gieng im rehte an sînen lip, |
| Qu'il ne plorast ne s'en tenist, | daz er den neven und daz wîp |
| Por nul avoir, si a grant duel | ze arge haéte bedâht. |
| Mot het le nain de Tintaguel. | und die in dar an haéten brâht, |
| Las! fait li rois' or ai veü | die verfluochte er tûsent stunde |
| Que li nains m'a trop deceü | mit herzen und mit munde, |
| En est arbre me fist monter, | er verwéiz ie genôte |
| Il ne me pout plus ahonter, | dem getwerge Melôte, |
| De mon nevo me fist entendre | daz es in haéte betrogen |
| Mençonge, porquoil ferai prendre, | und ime sein reeine wîp belogen. etc. |
| Por ce me fist metre en aïr, | 14920-32. |
| De ma mollier faire haïr. etc. | |
| 258-72. | |

This is an incontestable and indeniable similarity of situation, the same comical sight: the King in the tree, cursing himself and the dwarf; himself for having been too credulous and the dwarf for having seemingly accused so wantonly.

| Beroul. | Gottfried. |
|---|---|
| Oiez du nain boçu Frocin: | Ein getwerc was in dem hove da, |
| Fors estoit, si gardoit en l'er | daz selbe solte namen han |
| Vit orient et Lucifer. | Melôt petit von Aquitan |
| Des estoiles les cors savoit, | und kunde, ein teil, alsô man giht, |
| Les set planestres devisoit. | umbe verhólne geschiht |
| 320-24. | an dem gestirne nahtes sehen. |
| | Trist., Melôt 14243-48. |

Also here a certain conformity: a dwarf gifted with supernatural power fulfilling the role of astrologer and spy in both texts. Whether the dwarf is called Frocin or Melôt matters little. Also the ring, the harp and the wonderful little dog (Petitcrëu) play an important part in all texts.

| Beroul. | Folie Tristan, éd. Bédier, v. 953. |
|---|---|
| La roine avoit en son doi | Lors me donastes votre anel, |
| Un anel d'or del don le roi, | de or esmeré, ben fait et bel. |
| O esmeraudes planteïz. | |
| 1811-13. | |

Here we have the "anel" of Thomas and the "vingerlin" of Gottfried; also Petitcrëu is mentioned by Béroul and in the Folie Tristan:

„Un chenet ke vus purchaçai
E ço fu le Petit crëu
Ke vus tant cher avez ëü."
Folie Tristan, éd. Bédier, v. 760-62.

If there is any music it is generally the harp that is being played:

| | |
|---|---|
| „Harpeur fu, harper saveit" | „den harphete er so schône |
| Bédier, Folie Tristan, v. 767. | und gie den noten sô rehte mite". |
| | Gottfried, Tristan, 3616-17. |

Also in the "Roman de Tristan" (manuscrit de Paris 750 fol. 124b) we read: „ele ratempre autre foiz sa harpe en tele maniere com ele voloit dire son chant et commence son lay en tel manière com vous orroiz". This fully proves that analogies of minor importance are to be found in all Tristan texts whether in poetry or in prose. We must not forget that the story was exceedingly popular and that a Tristan without philtre, harp, dwarf, ring, dog etc., is as unthinkable as a Hamlet without Ghost.

## THE MYTH OR SAGA ITSELF.

The Saga or Myth itself is as old as the world. From the remotest times we can trace similar stories and the belief that certain philtres or potions were able to kindle love and to impart it to other persons, dates from the seventh day of creation, and has not fully died out even nowadays. Considered from this point of view none of the writers of any Tristan would be original — and neither "li lovendranc, li vin herbez", of Béroul, nor "ein tranc von minnen im glasevässelin" of Gottfried, the fateful drop on which the whole story is based, would be the own and proper idea of any of the poets in question; only the confounding of the love potions is novel and original. The philtre has played an important role in many previous and later poems (or plays) either to soporify the senses (Romeo and Julia) or to stimulate them in order to rouse love or sensual desires (Faust, Hexenküche)

> Du siehst, mit diesem Trunk im Leibe,
> Helenen bald in jedem Weibe.

In short — there is nothing original in the famous love story only — and that is the main point — that each poet has told it in his own original style and has added some novel episodes to it. The underlying facts or themes can be traced in many previous legends. Scenes as the "Holmgang" may date from the times of the Vikings, the tribute imposed on King Marke by the King of Ireland to deliver a certain number of virgins, is found in the Saga of the Minotaur, the fight with monsters is also found in Greek mythology; a woman healing wounds otherwise incurable: the Paris-Oenone theme, Isolde's order to kill Brangaene and the subsequent bringing of a dog's tongue is found in the old Geneviève (Genoveva) legend only that the tongue of a fawn is taken instead; several themes are to be found in the Odyssey for

instance Tristan coming in disguise: Ulysses returning to Ithaka, and his being recognized by his dogs; white and black sail in the Theseus legend; in short: old Kings betrayed by their young wives, abductions, trecherous dwarfs etc., are to be found in many works, legends and tales prior to Tristan.

As far as the loving couple as such is concerned, we may say that every nation possesses a similar one and that their fate is generally not less tragical. The time into which we may put the nascence of the Saga was very favourable for a poem setting forth in song the vicissitudes of a loving couple. It might perhaps not be uninteresting to recall the fact that one of the most interesting and tragic love-stories of all times and nations probably took place at a comparatively short time before the poem of Tristan and Isolde was written, namely the story of Abailard and Heloise; (Abailard born at Palais near Nantes in 1079 [1]) ). In dissertations about Tristan and Isolde all couples of ancient and modern times are generally enumerated, but this couple, which I consider to be very important for the Saga, is never mentioned. Does not the illegitimate son of Abailard and Heloise remind us of the son of Riwalin and Blanchefleur born under similar circumstances? The son of Abailard and Heloise dies but they live — Tristan lives and his parents die — antithesis of tragedy. It is very likely that the different Tristan authors may have been deeply and profoundly influenced by the story of Abailard and Heloise which attracted the attention of the whole civilized Europe of that time and it is indeed astonishing that this important fact has so long escaped the attention of literary research, as in my opinion it has greatly contributed to giving the Tristan Saga its immense popularity, for Tristan and Isolde were popular in the very sense of the word. We meet their names in numerous works of the epoch — before and after Gottfried — we meet with them — only to mention a few — not to quote usual French works — in the "Roman de Renart":

---

[1]) If according to G. Paris Thomas commenced his Tristan between 1160-1170 and according to Röttiger between 1125 and 1140, and Bédier II, 46, completed it at the earliest in about 1160, and if we furthermore consider that Abailard died in 1142, the facts stated above deserve serious attention. Of course I do not want to say that their fate influenced the action, but simply, that they may have been a sort of stimulant for the various Tristan authors.

„De Tristan qui la chièvre fist
Qui assez bellement en dist.
Roman de Renart, 5-6.

Tristan is furthermore mentioned in the Minnesongs of Heinrich van Veldecke:

„Tristan musste sonder Dank
Treu wohl sein der Königinne,
Weil der Minnetrank ihn zwang
Mehr noch als die Kraft der Minne.
Die Macht der Liebe.

In German Literature Tristan is furthermore mentioned, before Gottfried, by Bernger von Horheim and after him by von Gliers, Reinmar von Zweter, Marner the Suabian and Ulrich von Lichtenstein — only to mention a few, for the references in French, English, Scandinavian and German letters can be augmented ad libitum. But not only poets were interested in the subject, nay — also painters, designers and weavers took hold of it, as can be seen by the manyfold frescos, paintings and worked tapestries representing scenes from Tristan. We find some of them at Castle Runkelstein, near Bozen,, at Convent Wienhausen near Celle (Hanover), and at the Erfurt Cathedral in the shape of a table cloth; the oldest may date from the 12th century but there are also later ones amongst them. The Runkelstein frescoes follow the Gottfridean tradition the rest the Eilhardian, recte Beroxian. This seems to prove that the subject itself interested the artists more than *any special versified descriptions did*. For them Tristan was Tristan and Isolde Isolde. There are some other objects refering to the story of the famous couple for instance a comb representing the scene at the Fountain (Bamberg Cathedral) and a small ivory cask (somewhere in England).

As far as the scene of action is concerned, it is difficult to say anything with certitude. The geographical understanding as well as that of botany and zoology, (a Rhinoceros was thought to be winged animal) was so primitive at the time, that the poets did probably not know themselves where the action took place. Where was Parmenie, Ermonie (in Sir Tristrem Ermenie)situated? Does the Saga play in England or on the continent? A satisfactory solution of the question has not yet been found.

I personally think with Schurig [1]) that originally Cornouaille (the Kurneval of Gottfried) was Cornu Galliae which later on became the name for the whole of Brittany (Bretagne) that Léonnois (the disapproved Lohnois of Gottfried) was the Old Duchy of Léonnois in the North-Western part of Brittany, the pays de Léon. We may justly suppose that originally Tintagel, (the Tintajoel of Gottfried) was Tinténiac, at a distance of about 40 kilometres (air line) south off coast (St. Malo) and that Kanoêl (Kanohel) was originally the Castle of the Dukes of Leonnois, built in 513 by Duke Riwal. Later on the place of action was transferred to England and then Canoel was identified with Carlisle and Leonnois became Lothian. The poets attached little importance to where the action took place and consequently geographical and ethnographical incoherence is constantly met with.

If in Gottfried Canoel was Carlisle (Zimmer Röttiger) [2]) etc., I do not see why "sunder(z) lant" with which Tristan's father had been enfeoffed by Duke Morgan should not have been the town of Sunderland-on-Wear near Newcastle. Is Lohnois (Leonois) Lothian or is it the Léonnois of Brittany? Gottfried makes the Themse a town (der bischof van Tamise) and Rudolf von Ems makes of the Themse the town of Lundune. It was not until after the end of the Crusades that geographical and scientifical notions got somewhat more precise and that they were still primitive until much later is gathered from the fact, that for Shakespeare Bohemia is still a country surrounded by the sea.

Every poet who is treating a certain subject thinks that he treats it or has treated it in the best and only perfect manner; this holds also good for Gottfried, who writes in the „Eingang":

> Ich weiz wol, ir ist vil gewesen,
> die van Tristande hânt gelesen;

---

[1]) Schurig Arthur, Der Roman von Tristan und Isolde in der bretonischen Urgestalt. Dresden 1923. To the map contained in Loth's: "Contributions à l'Etude des Romans de la Table Ronde" in which the author pronounces himself in favour of English scene (il est impossible de chercher au Roman de Tristan une autre patrie que l'Angleterre (page 63) one might easîly compare the map of the French General Staff: Rennes, Brest, Lorient and Nantes I: 320000, 1857.

[2]) Röttiger, der heutige Stand der Tristanforschung.

und ir ist doch niht vil gewesen,
die von im rehte haben gelesen.

But we must consider this statement with a certain reserve. Most poets of the time could neither read nor write — and this was also not deemed necessary for he who would or could compose an "aventiure" had it recited to him and then he began to re-recite it "begunde er si wider limen mit ganzen niuwen rimen" until someone began to write the poem or story down, if it had deserving qualities. From this we see that the poets in question had *heard more* about Tristan *than they had read* about him and Gottfried's allusion is therefore more a sign of pride of his ability to handle the pen than anything else. In spite of his assurance that Thomas of Bretagne is the only poet who has written the true and original story of Tristan — he begins to seek i. e. reads all and listens to all relative to the subject, thus refuting his assertion that the text of Thomas is the only right one, for, if he had thought what he said, the search for other texts would have been superfluous. He does so in the interest of his work for he wishes to dissipate any doubt the reader or auditor might have as to the veracity of his version of the lamentable story. Other poets do the same. Does not Béroul write in his "Tristran".

N'en sevent bien l'estoire,
Berox l'a mex en son memoire.

or

Ne, si come l'estoire dit
La ou Berox le vit escrit.

or Thomas himself:

"Asez sai que chescun en dit
E ço qu'il unt mis en escrit
Mès sulun ço que j'ai oï,
Nel dient pas sulun Breri
2217-20 ï)

---

[1]) The same in Chevrefoil, 5:
"plusurs le me unt cunté e dit
e jeo l'ai trové en escrit.
Wendelin Foerster says of this method, Cligés, Einleitung, page XLIV „Was er (Thomas) von seinen Quellen und deren kritischer Sichtung selbst erzählt, ist nichts als Flunkerei, immer derselbe Kunstgriff, den Spielleute und Troveor gemein haben.

Very similar to this Hartmann von Aue writes in „der arme Heinrich"

Ein ritter sô gelêret was,
daz er an den buôchen las,
swaz er dar geschrieben vant.

an mislichen buôchen:
da an begunde er suochen,
ob er iht des funde" etc.

Needless to say that the learned knight is Hartmann himself. Wolfram von Eschenbach refers in a similar manner to the "aventiure" of his Parzival:

Ich, Wolfram von Eschenbach,
zwaz ich von Parzival gesprach
des sin aventiur mich wiste,
etlich man daz priste. etc.

It seems to have been the custon of poets (and it is still the same at present) to push their erudition, their investigations and bookish knowledge into the foreground; has a poet succeeded in writing a work unique in its kind, the same method of recommendation is followed either by the copiers or editors, who praise their text in a more or less puffing and boasting manner; if this in done by advertisement to-day it was formerly done in the text or on the frontispiece of the works; hence we can read: "enlarged to almost as much againe as it was", — "according to the true and perfect copy", Hamlet, 1604 (thus probably with Shakespeare's approval) "published to the true and original copies" (1627) "an excellent and conceited tragedie" (Romeo and Juliet) and, in humoristical works: "full of delight, wit and honest mirth" (Tarlton's Jests, Lond 1638). Or in Germany: „Das Narrenschiff/ alle ständ der Welt betreffend/. Wie man sich in allen Händeln weisslich halten soll. Einem jeden sehr nützlich/ lüstig und kürtzweilig zu lesen. Jetzund wider mit vil schönen Figuren geziert und zugericht. 1566." etc.

So we must not take Gottfried's allusion to Thomas too literally; there is, in my opinion, no congeniality, no poetical relationship! On the other hand Gottfried has much in common with and is much akin to the greatest French poet of that epoch, namely with Chrestien de Troyes, who, let us recall it — has also written a Tristan.

## CHRESTIEN DE TROYES.

I have already said in the course of these remarks that it is not at all impossible that Gottfried may have known the great Chrestien personally and it is quite clear that significant conclusions might be drawn from this possibility. Gottfried's general views of the world and of life as expressed in "Tristan" justify the belief that the poem was written by a mature man — well versed in worldly wisdom. Let us suppose that Gottfried was 40 years of age when he began writing his Tristan and let us, furthermore, presume that it was begun between about 1210 and 1215; if we assume the death of Chrestien to have taken place in 1192 at the earliest and in 1195 at the latest, for in 1190 he commenced writing his unfinished work: "Le Roman de Lancelot du Lac" (or "de la Charette"), Gottfried would have been 25 or 27 years old at the time of Chrestien's death. Chrestien de Troyes was the greatest French poet of his time and one of the greatest poets of the middle ages in general. Though we do not possess the manuscript we know that Chretien has written a "Tristan" or more precisely speaking a "Roman del Roy Marc et d'Iselt la blonde":

„Cil qui fist d'Erec et d'Enide,
Et les commandement d'Ovide,
Et l'ars d'amors en romans mist,
Et le mors de l'espaulle fist
Del roi Marc et d'Iselt la blonde". etc.

Chrestien was not only famous in France, but also in England, Germany, Italy and Spain, in short — in all those parts of Europe where there was any interest for Literature — thus he was surely known in Strasbourg where the young poet lived, whose ardent desire it must have been, according to all human probability, to see the great Chres-

tien in person. If this has been the case — and how easily it may have been so — Gottfried is sure to have seen and read the Master's manuscript, and even if Chrestien lived at that time at the Court of Flandres it does not decrease the possibility, for the distance from Strasbourg to either place was not a great one. We know, that the art of poetry was taught to a certain extent and as the Alsation Reinmar der Alte instructed Walther von der Vogelweide, why should Chrestien not have been the adviser of Gottfried. For there is really something of the same fluid in the two great men: their whole poetic art, manner and style, their power of penetration, their art of shaping characters (as well as their defaults) all this makes me think that Gottfried has known the manuscript of Chrestien's Tristan.

The importance of Chrestien missing manuscript is generally overlooked in spite of the fact that an authority like Novati has long ago referred to it. Röttiger, however, in his essay: "Der heutige Stand der Tristanforschung", page 28, does not seem to attach too much importance to it nay, even doubts that Chrestien has written a Tristan at all, because he (Chrestien) writes "del roy Marc et d'Yselt la blonde" i. e. does not mention the name Tristan; though in Cligés he freqeuntly mentions the Couple, sometimes Tristan, Yseut, sometimes Yseut-Tristan 3147-48 just as it suits the rhyme. He (Röttiger) furthermore doubts Chrestien to have written a Tristan, because in another work, which G. Paris takes for an adaption from Chrestien, King Marke plays a very miserable and lamentable part. These arguments are very feeble: in the first place it is not at all necessary that a poem is given the title or name of the principal person in it (as in the "Merchant of Venice"), secondly may Chrestien have had his own reasons for not calling his poem "Tristan" [1]) and thirdly does King Marke play anything but a dignified role in Gottfried's Tristan; in my opinion there is no French adaption from Chrestien's work for the simple reason that all French Tristans we know, are mediocre if compared to the vigorous style of Chrestien; the same opinion has been expressed by Löseth.

[1]) In 1901 Wendelin Foerster has first spoken of Cliget as an anti-Tristan and Paris calls it "un nouveau Tristan, mieux adapté que l'ancien etc". There can be no doubt that Chrestien has written a Tristan, otherwise he would not have announed it to his contemporaries, who knew perfectly well what he had produced.

As far as style is concerned Chrestien stands as far above his French contemporaries as Gottfried is above the German poets of his time. Let us just compare some verses of Chrestien and Gottfried; to begin with the famous play on words: amer.

La reine garde s'an prant
Et voit l'un et l'autre sovant
Descolorer et anpalir
Et sospirer et tressaillir;
Mes ne set, por quo il le font
Fors que por la mer, ou il sont.
Espoir bien s'an aparceüst,
Se la mers ne la deceüst;
Mes la mers l'angingne et decoit
Si qu'an la mer l'amer ne voit;
Qu'an la mer sont, et d'amer vient;
Et s'est amers li maus, qui tient
Cligés, 541-52.

Der Minnen vederpil Isôt,
„lameir", sprach si „daz ist min nôt,
lameir daz swaeret mir den muot,
lameir ist, daz mir leide tuot"
dô si lameir sô dicke sprach,
ér bedâhte unde besach
anclichen unde kleine
des selben wortes meine,
sus begúnde er sich versinnen,
l'ameir das waere minnen,
l'ameir bitter, la meir mer.
Gott. Tristan 11989-99.

It it evident that Gottfried can only have found this play on words in Chrestien, it does not exist in Thomas! It powerfully and indeniably confirms that Gottfried does not only depend on Chrestien as far as poetical art is concerned no, we see that there is very striking textual similarity and that Gottfried is much more akin to Chrestien than to Thomas. There is also much similarity in the love complaints Alexandre — Soredamors and Tristan — Isôt.

| Cliges. | Tristan. |
|---|---|
| Amors li a el cors anclose. 878. | Minn' aller herzen lâgerin und sleich z'ir beider herzen in. 11715—16. |

But especially striking is the similarity in the chapter (Cligés) when Alexander comes to the court of King Arthur which strongly reminds us of Tristan standing before King Marke for the first time:

,Alexandres, biaus amis chiers!
Je vos retaing mout volantiers
Et mout me plest et mout me heite;

„deú sal, bêâs vassal!....
Marke sprach aber Tristan zuo:
„ich sage dir, Tristan, waz du tuo;

Car mout m'avez grant encor feite,
Quant venuz estes a ma cort.
Mout vuel que l'an vos i enort.
Con franc vassal et sage et douz.
Trop avez esté a genouz
Relevez sus, jel vos comant,
Et soiiez des ore an avant
De ma cort et de moi privez;
Qu'a buen port estes arrivez"

Cligés 373-84.

du solt mich einer bete gewern,
der wil ich von dir niht entbern.
. . . . . .
„du solt min jägermeister sin!"
mit guote „friunt", sprach Marke dô
diz ist gelobet, nu sî alsô"!

Tristan, 3352—5576.

Let us only look at the following passage in which the similarity is not less striking: [1])

„Hai! con vaillant chevalier!
con fet ses anemis pleissir!
con roidement il les requiert....
veez or comant cil se prueve,
veez com il se tient au ranc,
veez com il portaient de sanc
et sa lance et s'espee nue!
Veez comant il les remue!
Veez, quant il vient au l'estor,
com il a po son escu chier,
que il le leisse detranchir
. . . . . .
et dient que buer seroit nee
cui il avoit s'amor donee!

Chevalier au Lion, 3199.

„seht", sprachen si, „der jungelinc
der ist ein sáeliger man:
wie saelicliche stêt im an
alles daz, daz er begât
wie gar sin lip ze wunsche stât
wie gânt im so geliche enein
diu siniu keiserlichen bein!
wie rehte sîn schilt z'aller zit
an siner stat gelimet lit!
wie zimet der schaft in siner hant.
wie wol stât allez sin gewant!
wie stât sin houbet und sin hâr!
wie süeze ist aller sin gebâr!
wie saelecliche stât sin lip!
ô, wol si saelecliche wip,
der fröude an ime beliben sol"

Riwal & Blanch. 702-16.

To this we may add numerous exclamations and locutions alike in Chrestien and Gottfried as for instance: „bêâs-biaus amis" „alez avant!" (Cligés). „Cil respondent: "Au boin eür" (Guillaume, 3212) „a bón eüre" sprach daz kint, (Gott, Trist, 32200), in short the predi-

[1]) The translation which Bédier gives in Thomas I, page 10, of the Gottfredian verses is not quite correct. (in any case rather free).

lection for expressions like: "biau sire, biaus amis, dous amis, moult volentiers" (mû voluntiers) etc. Furthermore:

Si dist: „Roi, deus vos beneie,
Et vostre biele compagnie"
Perceval, 22238-39.

„Ei" sprach er, „dê benie
Si sainte companie.
Gottfr. 2683-84.

Is not the beginning of Cligés based on the same poetical principles as Gottfried's Tristan not to speak of the astonishing similarity of action (Anti-Tristan).

... Ceste estoire trovons escrite
Que conter vos vuel et retreire,
Au un des livres de l'aumeire.
.....
Don cest romanz fist Crestiiens
Li livre est mout anciiens,
Qui tesmoingne l'estoire a voire,
Par ce fet ele miauz a croire.
Par les livres que nos avons
Les fez des anciiens savons
Cligés 18-28.

... und an britûnschen buochen las
aller der lanthérren leben
und ez úns ze kunde hat gegeben
.....
sus treip ich manege suoche
unz ich an einem buoche
alle sine jehe gelas
wie dirre âventiure was.
Gottfried, 152-66.

And how much are they not akin in the descriptions of fights! Not the simple fact, the mere action makes the greatness of a poet, nay, the way and manner in which he describes it.

CHRESTIEN.

Mès les espées moult sovant
Jusq' as cropes des chevax colent,
Del sang s'abroivent et saolent ...
Tant le paine, tant le travaille
Que à merci venir l'estuet
Come l'aloe qui ne puet
Davant l'esmerillon durer
Ne ne sa ou aséurer.
(Lancelot)

GOTTFRIED.

Sus ging er in mit slegen an,
Biz er 'm mit slegen an gewan
Daz Tristan von der slege nôt
Den schilt ze verre von im bôt,
Unde den schirm ze hohe truoc,
Biz daz er im daz diech slúoc
Einen álse nach hin zem tóde wac
Daz ime daz fleisch und daz bein.
(Morold 6923-31.) etc.

or descriptions like these:

| | |
|---|---|
| Il samble à cels qui les agardent | Er fuorte mit im an den kampf |
| Que lor elme esprendent et ardant: | Beidiu rôuch únde tampf |
| Et quant à l'èspée s'aseilent | Und ándére stiure |
| Estenecles ardans en saillent | An zenen unde an griffen; |
| Aussi comme del fer qui fume | Die wáren gesliffen, |
| Que li fevre bat for l'enclume | Sêre scharph unde wahs |
| Quant il l'atrait de la fornage. | Noch wahser danna ein scharsahs. |
| (Cliget.) | (Tr. der Kampf mit dem Drachen) |

Here we find real epic-dramatic poetry, plastic description as well in Gottfried as in Chrestien; there is "go" in it and the narrative seems to be the conception of congenial minds (though their is no textual concordance) and for this power we will seek in vain in the works of other medieval poets and even in the "Nibelungen" the descriptions of fighting scenes are in no case superior to these. Such energy, such concision of style, such vivacity and descriptive power we will only find in the works of Chrestien and Gottfried; but not only in epic representation we will meet with consonance, there is also much analogy in rythm, plan and composition in general:

| Chrestien, Guillaume d'Engleterre: [1]) | Gottf. Tristan, Eingang. |
|---|---|
| Cil s'en vont, et li roi remaint | Ir ist só vil, die des nu pfleget, |
| Qui molt se demente et complaint; | Daz si daz guote z'übele wegent, |
| Molt se complaint, molt se demente, | Daz übel wider zu guote wegent; |
| Riens nule ne li atalente. | Die flegent niht, si widerpflegent. |

---

[1]) I have not hesitated to quote from „Guillaume d'Engleterre" because authorities like Wilmotte and Wendelin-Foerster have pronounced themselves in favour of Chrestien's authorship. „Man hat es früher (Guillaume) immer allgemein unserem Dichter zugeschrieben; erst 1870 erhebt K. Hoffman (Sitzungsberichte der kgl. bayr. Akad., II, 51) ohne irgend näheren Beweis Einspruch gegen diese Zuweisung, dem sich später P. Meyer (Rom.. VIII, 315) ohne den Versuch irgend einer Begründung anschliesst..... Um die Frage zu entscheiden, muss auch der Stil, das Vokabular und die Phraseologie, vor allem aber die Sprache des Gedichts mit den echt kristianischen Gedichten verglichen werden. Diese Untersuchung hat mit voller Sicherheit die Kristianität des Wilhelmslebens erwiesen". Wendelin-Foerster, Einleitung zu Kristian von Troyes Cligés. „On a contesté à Chrétien de Troyes cette oeuvre, mais toujours sans motifs

This as to rythm; in plan and composition we find the same analogy:

| Chrestien, Guillaume d'Engleterre: | Gottfried, Eingang. |
|---|---|
| Chrestien se veut entremettre | Ich hân mir eine unmüezekeit |
| Sans vient oster et sans vient metre. | Der werlt ze liebe vür geleidt. |
| ..... | ..... |
| Chrestien, Chevalier de la Charette. | ..... |
| Je l'anprandrai mout volantiers... | ich wil in wol bemaeren |
| Del chevalier de la Charette | von edelen senedaeren. |
| Comance Crestiens son livre." | daz lege ich mîner willekür |
| | allen edelen herze vür. |

This is kinship of mind, style and poetical art and exposition yet the one independent of the other and, this congeniality has struck others before me. Of course, I shall not go so far as Firmery [2]) who pretends that when reading Gottfried's Tristan after Cliget one has the feeling that art and country have hardly changed. So far I do not go, but I am convinced that no one but Chrestien taught Gottfried the "ars poetica". Also the clear mind of Prof. Hoepffner, Strasbourg, thinks that Gottfried may have resided for some time "tra los montes", for what he (Gottfried) has written, Hoepffner says „c'est vu et c'est vécu" [3]) thus if it is "vu et vecu" it cannot be simply: "lu et traduit".

In all the works of Chrestien we find an enormous vivacity, a variety of splendid metaphores, alliterations etc., etc., as, in German Literature we only meet them in the work of Gottfried. In Chrestien and Gottfried we see and hear natural beings; in Hartmann and Wolfram for instance, only conventional ones. The types of Gottfried and Chrestien are living persons, those of Hartmann and Wolfram mere shadows, in short the congeniality between Chrestien and Gott-

---

valables..... J'ai repris l'examen du problème dans Romania (XI. VI. Isq.) et je crois avoir établi que le Chrétien des vers 1—18 de notre poème est bien celui qui, au début de Cligés, nous a donné une énumération, d'ailleurs incomplète, de ses écrits" Wilmotte, Introduction Chrétien de Troyes, Guillaume d'Angleterre.

[2]) Firmery, Notes critiques sur quelques traductions de poèmes français du moyen âge, Lyon, 1901.

[3]) Hoepffner, Ernest, Les Influences littéraires de la France sur les Lettres en Alsace, Strasbourg, 1925.

fried is striking and indeniable; no wonder that the originality and productivity of Chrestien was immensely exploited by other poets (French as well as German) and there is no doubt that also Gottfried owes a good deal to him. If Gottfried has composed his Tristan according to a French model, and, there can, in my opinion, not be any doubt — he has adapted his Tristan from the French text of Chrestien de Troyes, the great Chrestien, the congenial Chrestien — to whom Gottfried resembles as to no other poet of his time.

The Celtic people invented the legend or Saga, some poets would naturally write it down; as the plot was interesting — quite a number of poets "tackled the subject" and amongst them: La Chièvre, Béroul, Thomas, Chrestien, Eilhard and Gottfried; the one necessarily depends more or less upon the other and the palm to him who has acquitted himself with the greatest credit. I think this reasoning is reasonable reasoning. I have already said that Gottfried did not hide his source or sources, ad least the general ones and I cannot understand why Piquet says in his "Originality" page 8, note 5: „Dans sa digression littéraire Gottfried n'a pas nommé Eilhard parmi les epiques dont le talent honore l'Allemagne. Est-ce mépris pour l'art frustre du vieux conteur? Est-ce crainte d'entourer d'une auréole glorieuse un concurrent génant? The reply to this is very simple. Had the German Tristan par excellence already been written (by Eilhard) Gottfried would not have commenced one; he knew Eilhard's composition very well and of course understood the literary possibilities the subject offered if treated by a superior mind.

And as Chrestien and Gottfried resemled in life, they also resembled in death: Death prevented Chrestien from finishing his last work: Perceval (or Lancelot):

„Chrestiens de Troie,
Qui de Perceval comencha,
Mais la mors, qui l'adevancha,
Ni li laissa pas traire affin".

and found a worthy though not equal continuator (of Lancelot) in Godefroi de Ligne who reverently indicates the place where Chrestien stopped and he commenced to write — just as Ulrich von Türheim and Heinrich von Freiberg do in the case of Gottfried.

I venture to assert that it was in the first place Chrestiën who inspired, influenced and taught Gottfried and in spite of his (Gottfried's) greatness I cannot help thinking, that he adhered pretty closely to his French model which, in my opinion, can only have been the lost manuscript of "Del Roy Marc et d'Yselt la blonde" [1]) but, of course, it is impossible to say anything with absolute certainty.

Resuming I shall once more quote Hoepffner: (Les Influences Littéraires, page 8) „c'est enfin un style brillant qui jusque dans ses défauts, c'est à dire un penchant trop prononcé vers la préciosité et l'effet oratoire, rapelle d'une façon saisissante la manière de nos grands trouvères, *en première ligne celle de notre meilleur conteur de Chrestien de Troyes*".

In the following chapters I shall examine the French Element in Gottfried's work: words, locutions, rhymes etc., as well as the landscape (fauna and flora) and the geographical and nautical conditions or possibilities contained in Tristan and and hope that this inquiry may to some extent contribute to elucidating matters.

---

[1]) Professor Philipot, Rennes, thinks that the disappearance of this manuscript is not accidental; he writes „L'église prêchait en chaire contre les corruptions de l'école de Chrétien de Troyes, contre „Tristan et Yseult" (dont il ne reste que des fragments) et cette destruction ne me paraît pas due au hasard".

## DER EINGANG.

As to the names Tristan and Isôt, the following: Röttiger [1]) believes as do Zimmer, [2]) Lot, [3]) Bédier[4]) and Loth [5]) that the name Tristan is derived from the pictic Drostan (Drest or Drost) and Isôt from the Germanic Ishilt or the cymric Essylt—Anglo—Saxon Ethylda. [6])

But whatever the eymology of the name may be — one thing is sure that Gottfried knew nothing of such derivation and that for him the name Tristan signified "triste", triure (see Rual li foitenant) and, in my opinion, this seems natural and befitting considering the sad and sorrowful circumstances of his birth. Hence the name "Tristan" any other interpretation of the word would be contradictory to common sense as far as Gottfried's Tristan is concerned. The name "Tristan" has been translated into German as "Schmerzensreich" so for instance in "Genoveva" whose son received this name. I consider the "Eingang" to be wholly and purely Germanic (German) without any foreign influence having been exercised on it. A part may have been written before Gottfried and decided upon the source or version he intended to follow, in spite of his allusion to Thomas. It is absolutely German in style and conception. The numerous alliterations constitute a typical Gottfridian — German predilection and have remained it until the present day. Rückert, Schiller, Goethe, and especially Bürger have had the same (racial) preference for them. Schikaneder, the author of the libretto of the "Zauberflöte", imortalised by Mozart's music uses an alliteration, similar to: "ein man ein

---

[1]) Röttiger, der heutige Stand der Tristanforschung, page I.
[2]) Zeitschrift für franz. Sprache und Literatur, XIII. p. 58.
[3]) Lot, Ferdinand, Romania XXV, p. 22.
[4]) Bédier, Thomas II p. 110.
[5]) Loth, J. Contributions à l'Etude des Romans de la Table Ronde, p. 16.
[6]) Herz' famous Langenargen "Tristan" of 807 may also have been a "Cristan".

wip, ein wip ein man", probably without having known that of Gottfried, thus instinctively;

Mann und Weib und Weib und Mann,
Schliessen sich der Gottheit an.
. . . . . .
Swem nie von Liebe leit geschach,
Dem geschach ouch liep von liebe nie."

Especially these verses are purely German and illustrate perfectly well the absolutely German concentration of the poet's mind when he wrote "Der Eingang". They belong to the few Middle High German verses which have become proverbial in New High German (besides a number of Walther van der Vogelweide) "Wem nie durch Liebe Leid geschah" has been made the title of several German novels and volumes of poetry

As to the acrostic "G. D. I. E. T. E. R. I. C. H. T." contained in the "Eingang" I consider it worth while to point out a second one in the same chapter namely: line 131 begins with "Ich" thus with "I" and the beginning line of quatrain 135 with "Tuon" thus with "T" = Isôt, Tristan as against, Tristan-Isot in the first. If the question of the acrostic is considered to be of importance then this one cannot be passed over in silence.

This, as well as the following chapters are treated from a purely *Gottfridean point* of *view i. e. no comparision* will be made with the other existing Tristan texts: Considered as whole the scene seems to take place in France and it appears that Gottfried has adhered pretty closely to his original. Whereever thus Parmenie, Lohnois, Britanje, etc. have been situated they are given a rather French aspect and the names of the acting persons are no less French. It is striking in the first place that Gottfried refers to Charles the Great:

„der alles daz, was ime geschieht,
Mit Karles lôte gelten wil."
274-75.

This makes me think that the versified story is seen from a French point of view (at least partly) considering that Charlemagne was a Franco-German Emperor and thus much more popular in France and Germany respectively than in England. Gottfried furthermore says in verse 303 "dô sin leben ze lebene vienc"; this seems to be a direct translation from the French: "vivre sa vie", commenca vivre sa vie; in any case this turning is not very German and must have been rather novel at the time. I shall not refer to names like: "li duc Morgan, Rûal li foitenant", etc., but strongly in favour of French scene and surroundings is, that Riwalin addresses Blanscheflur in French: "â dê vûs sal, la bêle" and she answers in French: "merzi" and Gottfried continues in the same Language: "dit la buzêle" — (pucelle). This proves that there were no difficulties of linguistic order, greeting and reply seem quite natural, as if given in the native tongue of the acting persons. It would be wrong to think that at the time of action French was the well known and wide-

ly spread Language of nowadays and that it would have been a natural thing (for the actors) to speak and understand it in England (whether it was Wales, Lothian, Carlisle, Cornwall would not matter) the rest of the line: "dit la buzêle" was probably in the French original as well as the following:

„Da Riwalin, da Blan(s)cheflur (flor)
da beide, da léal amûr" (amor)

As far as the description of spring is concerned, the reference to limetress and nightingales seems to betray a German landscape, especially the lime-tree is a favorite object of German poets; but the rest: flowers, sun, mountains, valleys seems to be of French ardor and strongly remind us of the beginning of Chrestien's Perceval.

---

## RUAL LI FOITENANT.

The orphan is given the significant name: "Tristan" for the reasons already stated in the "Eingang"; any other interpretation of the name must be considered with a certain reserve. In verses 1995-2001 we read relative to the name:

„Nu heizet triste triure.
Sô wart daz kint Tristan genant.
Von triste Tristan waz sin nam.

Contrary to Perceval, who grows up in complete ignorance, Tristan receives a most careful education, he learns Languages and Music. Besides a few (French) words like: „leisieren, sambellieren and beneken (from the French bénékié?) the French element is of no importance.

---

## DIE ENTFÜHRUNG.

The beginning of this chapter apparently confirms the hypothesis of Röttiger (based on Zimmer) that Canôel is Carlisle in England, on the river Eden (confluence of Eden, Petteril and Coldney) situated at a distance of about 12 miles from Port Carlisle at the mouth of the above mentioned river. From a geographical and nautical point of view the following would thus be correct:

Daz von Norwaege über sê
Ein koufschif unde deheinez mê
In daz lant ze Parmenie kam
Und sin gelende da genam
Und ûz gestiez ze Kanoêl
Vür daz selbe kastël.

Evidently the rhyme "Kanoêl - Kastël" was in the French original. It may seem strange that young Tristan speaks Norwegian, for, learning Languages at that time meant to acquire a knowledge of Latin, Greek and perhaps some French and Italian. The knowledge of Norwegian Tristan posesses may, however, be explained by the following: Though the Danes had in 827 destroyed the town of Carlisle they nevertheless settled down there and it thus by personal intercourse with their descendants that he learnt the Language; but even if the action took place in France Tristan's knowledge of Danish would not be astonishing, on the contrary, it might appear still more natural; after the first Norman invasion in about 900 the Norman Language i. e. Danish-Norwegian had probably not fully died out in France and Tristan could thus easily learn it.

The circumstances under which Tristan's abduction takes place seem to be against Kanoêl being Carlisle. If the Norwegians had lifted anchor in Carlisle it would have taken them at least some hours before reaching the mouth of the river — and if they had started from Port Carlisle Tristan would have immediately noticed his being abducted on account of the motion of the sea which, in the primitive vessels of those days, would have made the continuation of the game of chess impossible and which very likely would also have made him sea-sick.

Kurvenal is sent from board after a "grôze mile", he is given some bread which would not have been necessary if they had been on the river, for he could have easily rowed ashore but "er swebete ûf dem sê" and returns home "in kurzer stunde"; ergo Canoêl cannot have been Carlisle in the Gottfredean version This assumption is strengthened by the fact that on hearing of Tristan's abduction his foster-parents, overwhelmed with grief and smart, exclaim in French:

„Béâs Tristant, curtois Tristant,
Ton cors, ta vie a dê commant. 2395-96. [1])

Now I reason that alone and in such affliction every one would speak in the Language he knows best, viz: his native tongue, which, in the case of Rûal and Floraete would have been French according to this "raisonnement", also strongly favoured by their respective names. In tempest and storm it takes the Norwegians 8 days to land at the coast of Kurnewal, they have thus, probably, not seen land. When the pilgrims see Tristan they immediately address him in French: "déû sal, béâs amis!" and Tristan replies just as naturally in the same Language: "dê benie, si sainte companie". As Gottfried has apparently taken these exclamation from the French text, the French author or authors have thus always had French people and French country in mind. The pilgrims are proceeding to Tintajôle at a distance of eine "walsche mile", thus no unit of linear measures Why shoned distances in Kurnewale (England) be measured by "walsche", i. e. not English "miles"? Taking all in all the scene seems to be in France; seeing the unity of Language. Tristan leaves a country where they speak French (his foster-parents) and comes to a country where people are apparently accustomed to addressing each other in the same Language, as seen by the pilgrims.

---

[1]) This might be a proof in favour of the argument that the work from which Gottfried adapted was a "Tristant" and not a "Tristan". Chrestien uses Tristan and Tristanz. (Cligés, etc.).

## DIE JAGD.

When approaching the hunters, linguistic difficulties are not apparent for Tristan converses with them without any difficulty; only customs and habits seem to differ, especially as far as hunting is concerned. When the terms "furkie", "massenie" and "curie", doubtlessly taken from the French text, are employed, the simple hunters do not understand them i. e. terms existent in their Language but unknown to them. For that they are all speaking French results from the exclamation of the hunters:

„Curie? dê benie!"
Sprachen si alle, „waz ist daz."
2960-61.

There can be no doubt, that the whole line: „curie, dê benie" must have been in the text Gottfried had before him — it as a direct quotation.

„diz heizent si curie
dâ heime in Parmenie."
3017-18.

The retranslation into Modern French would be very simple: "cela s'appelle curie, chez nous en Ermenie". (Parmenie) "Chez nous-dâ heime" seems more to indicate a different region, district or part of one and the same land than a foreign country. When Tristan says: „jensît Britanje lit ein lant, deist Parmenie genannt" he can in my opinion, only have meant a part of France. It furthermore strikes me,, that the hunters understand the signification of the name Tristan, for, when Tristan reveals his identity one of them exclaims: "dêus adjut" and continues: "it would have been more befitting if you were called:

"juvente bêle et la riant." As before said there is some reason to believe that in the original before Gottfried, Tristan was called Tristrant, (or Tristant) for the name Tristrant probably rhymed (visibly) with bêle et riant. Thus:

„..... Tristant (or Tristrant)
juvente bêle et la riant.

It is quite clear that the French exclamations are taken over from the French original; if Gottfried translates them into German he does so in order to be understood by his readers or auditors. This holds also good for the purely French (jambic) rhyme "Tintajoêl, â welch kastêl, dê te sal, Tintajoêl" (3166-67).

Verse 2001 begins with "a bóneûre" which in the French original will probably have been at the end of the line and have rhymed with "cur" — "cor" (corne) thus: bóneûr (e) cur. The conversation between Tristan and King Marke takes place in the most fluent and natural French. As to: "allez avant", contained in this chapter (3224), I have already pointed out that also Chrestien uses it. [1])

Tristan (seeing the King)
„deûs sal roi et sâ mehnie"

Those standing around:

„dê dûze aventiure si dûze crêatûre"
(translated in order that auditors understand)

Tristan, approaching the King: déû sal.
The King: deû sal, béâs vassal!
Tristan: merzi, gentil rois, édeler künic, (noble roi) Kurnewalois. (the voice of Chrestien seems to resound from these verses: Alexander standing before King Arthur (Cligés) etc.
All those present: Tristan, Tristan li Parmenois,
cum est béâs et cum cûrtois. 3257-3362.

Concluding we may say of "die Jagd": Gottfried reveals himself as a master in the description of hunting scenes; the Saga and Sir Tristrem are very meagre in details so that even Bédier is compelled

[1]) "Or oi mervoilles" fet Cligés.
"Alez avant, j'irai aprés (Cligés 5595-96).

to admit, Thomas I, page 49: "Gottfried est, comme on a vu, infiniment plus riche que S. en détails cynégétiques" — *thus Gottfried cannot have acquired his intimate knowledge of hunting terms from Thomas, must consequently found them somewhere else.* He was probably one of the first who introduced the French terms into the German vocabulary, which is also believed by Reynaud [1]). „Les descriptions de chasse que l'on rencontre chez certains poètes courtois comme Gottfried sont empruntées à des sources françaises et emploient un vocabulaire technique entièrement français d'origine".

---

## DER JUNGE KÜNSTLER.

This chapter might rightly be called the chapter of apparent linguistic confusion. Hitherto King Marke and Tristan have conversed in French. When Tristan has finished his first recital on the harp, the King asks him to play another song and Tristan replies: "mû volontiers". As to the harping we may say that it constitutes a national gaelic-celtic art; there are still public harping emulations or competitions being held in Wales nowadays and that in concequence there is nothing extraordinary in harping playing such an important part in Tristan, for Brittany (Bretagne) was inhabited at the time by a race which was either of the same (gaelic) origin or in any case by a people very much akin to it. Now we know that Celts, or their descendants, occupied Ireland, Wales, the Highlands of Scotland and the northern shores of France and that their Language was gaelic-celtic and that the were called "welsh", which means foreigner i. e. not English (it has the same meaning in German: "welsch" signifies in the first place not German and in a more restricted sense Italian (or French). Considering these facts we will without any difficulty understand the follow-wing, bearing in mind that besides French they spoke along the French shores Brittanic (breton), gallic-gallois and that in general the epoch was one of linguistic determination or fixation. Thus when King Marke questions Tristan as to his linguistic abilities he says: „I heard

---

[1]) L. Reynaud, Les Origines de l'Influence française en Allemagne, page 393.

you sing Breton, Gallois, Latin and French, do you these Languages?" The King mentions French last and in my opinion one might interprete the sentences as follows: Now Tristan, besides French you have sung Breton, gallois and Latin etc. etc., the mastering of French being taken for granted. [1]) 3611-3691.

Line 3614 "einen sénelîchen leich als ê" and line 3615 "de la cûrtoise Tispê" are probably taken from the original:

..... canté (s)
de la cûrtoise Tispê.

This seems also to be the case with lines 3700-01:

Norwaegen, Irlandaeren,
Alemanjen, Schotten unde Tenen,

where Irlandois will probably have rhymed with Danois. There can be no doubt that also lines 3751-52.

sîn vater, der marschalc dan Rûal
li foitenant et li léal."

have been in the French original. The title "dan" (-dant -dom) is now added to Rûals French name and surname.

Resuming: If the poet has in the preceding chapter "die Jagd" developed a thorough knowledge of hunting terms his knowledge of technical musical expressions is not less astonishing. Questioned as to:

"sambiût, waz ist daz, lieber man?" he replies:
daz beste seitespil, daz ich kan".

Adding to this words like "plectrún", (plectre), "symphonien" etc. — and considering the purely French rhymes like; galloise, françoise, etc., there can be no doubt that Gottfried has found these terms in his French text and that he was (as in hunting terms) one of the first to introduce them into the Middle High German vocabulary.

---

[1]) Generally however (Bechstein, Röttiger etc., etc.,) the mastering of English is presupposed, as Marke also mentions French when enumerating the Languages Tristan knows.

## EIN WIEDERSEHEN.

If we have called the preceding chapter the chapter of linguistic confusion we may call this one the chapter of geographical puzzles. When Rûal sets out in quest of Tristan to comes to Denmark where he meets the pilgrims Tristan has met 3 years before. They tell him that Tristan is in Kurnewale and it is astonishing that Rûal does not even know the name of this country:

„Nu wâ lit Kurnewâle hin?
„es stôzet", sprâchen jene zehant
jensit Britanje an daz lant".

Thus neighbouring states; the conversation, as usual, seems to get on in French, for, when taking leave of Rûal the pilgrims say: "a dê, a dê!". At the court of King Marke French seems to be the usual Language: when the courtiers see Rûal they cry: "sire, sire, dêu sal!"; evidently the rhyme: "sal, Rûal" was in the original. King Marke appears not to know Rûal's country for he is questioning him about it; we learn that it has taken Rûal about half a year to come from Denmark to Tintajóel. i. e. he takes some rest when reaching the shore in Denmark, which cannot have taken him much time (for he is travelling as fast he can) but he finds the vessels "unbereit"; at the first occasion, however, he sets forth, comes to Cornwall and immediately proceeds to Tintajóel. Counting the voyage Denmark-Kurnewal to have taken 3 weeks and the journey on foot another 3 weeks plus the 2 weeks interior of Denmark to port we get 2 months; he must consequently have waited 4 months for a ship for Kurnewal; this, however, does not seem to be very likely and I am more inclined to believe that he journeyed through a greater part of Europe, perhaps Holland, Belgium and France in order to reach Kurnewale — and

the necessary deduction can be drawn from this hypothesis, namely: that also in Gottfried "Kurnewale" may have been a part of the continent viz: France. [1]) It is possible that Gottfried imagines an English "Kurnewale" but he measures distances according to continental standards (or scales) — his mind may be in England but his body is on the continent.

## DIE SCHWERTLEITE.

In the whole Schwertleite there is not a single French locution or sentence — it is thoroughly German and independent as "der Eingang". Of French (foreign) words we only meet: "maniere, feitiure, banier, [2]) covertiure, figieren, cumpanie, prüevireen, buhudieren, garzûn, becrôieren", some of which have already been used in previous works; in the Nibelungen for instance we find: "buhudieren, covertiure, prüeven (prüevieren)".

## HEIMFAHRT UND RACHE.

Apart from the usual rhymes "massenie, cumpanie, Parmenie, kastél, Kanoél", rhyme 5349-60 is rather striking: "vil ritter Britûne, den waren pavelûne"; the word "pavelun" (e) does not seem to have been used very much in other Old French texts, the general word being: paveillon, pavellon (Chrestien) or pavellon, pavillion; it is thus possible that in the French Original breton rhymed with paveillon, the same would hold good for lines 5463-64: cumpanjûne-Britune (compaignon-breton).

When Duke Morgan is slain by Tristan, his followers cry:

â nostre sires, il est mort! [1])

This and the war-cry: "schevalier, Parmenie, Parmenie, schevalier"! increases my belief that the author or authors only had French people in mind when they wrote "Tristan".

[1]) Cornu Galliae = Brittany.

[2]) As to banier it was a military term brought to Gaul by the Franks in the 5th century and can thus hardly be considered a French word.

[3]) Hoepffner says of this rhyme (page 7, les Influences Littéraires) "quand on attend un vers comme celui-ci qui a pour notre oreille un air de famille".

## MOROLD.

How little reliable all geographical, ethnographical and historical indications are in Tristan is best gathered from the fact that the King of Ireland Gurmûn was an African, [1]) sent to Ireland by the Romans and that in consequence Ireland, Cornwall and England were tributary to Rome; in this case the action ought to have taken place during the Roman occupation between 43 and 410 A. D. i. e. before the coming of the Angles, Jutes, Saxons and Normans whereby the whole linguistic theory would be overthrown for if the action had really taken place at that time there would be no question of other Languages than of Celtic (gallois) and perhaps Latin. It is furthermore a well known historical fact that the Romans never mastered Ireland as Agricola never undertook the projected expedition to Hibernia. But that the action does not take place during the time of the Roman occupation of England can be seen by various facts: Christianity etc. In lines 6493-94 we meet with another direct translation from the French: "fierer contenanze ihn dûhte disiu schanze".

---

## TANTRIS.

As explained in "der Splitter" the name "Tantris" is a simple transposition of the letters: Tristan-Tantris-tant triste. (Who does not know French in Tristan?) The action this time takes place in Ireland and the author considers French as a foreign Language as seen by: „si kunde ir sprache dâ von Develin, si kunde franzois und latin" 7989-90 and

leich und sô fremediu notelin,
diu niemer fremediu kunden sîn,
in franzoiser wise
von Sanze und San Dinise" 8063-66.

---

[1]) Nobody seems to have thought of the fact that from a purely anthropological point of view it is rather strange that an African father and an Irish mother should have a daughter with golden or fair hair. Example: Feirefiss (Vair fiz) son of Gahmuret and Belakane (Parzival).

All musical terms on the other hand are given in French and Gottfried has evidently taken them from his French text: pasturêle, rundate, schanzûne, réfloit and folate" are such terms, which at that time probably only a Frenchman would know on condition that he would have a sound knowledge of music at the same time. Tristan pretends to be a Spaniard, knowing, that the risk of being confronted with a Spaniard or someone speaking this Language is very minimal. The measure taken by King Gurmûn, that anyone coming from Cornwall to Ireland would do so on pain of death would only have been efficient if the inhabitants of the two countries spoke different Languages for otherwise there would have been thousands of means to escape punishment — once landed in Ireland if would have been very difficult to say who was from Ireland and who from Cornwall had the Language been the same. If would have been necessary to survey the whole coast and that this is not done is seen by Tristan's landing. There must subsequently have existed easier means to apply the law and this was probably facilitated by the difference of Language. We have seen that King Marke, Tristan and the whole company in Cornwall spoke French and this significant fact induces Tristan to conceal his nationality and his native tongue — French. [1])

---

## DIE BRAUTFAHRT.

In this chapter Gottfried alludes to the golden hair of Isolde brought to Cornwall by a swallow "ce delicieux trait" as Wilmotte says, which is in Cliget and of which there is no trace in Thomas. It is significant that he (Gottfried) refers to it though he considers it to be void of truth. The poet was evidently well acquainted with all possible Tristan versions and I think it was with some "arrière pensée" that he so emphatically cites Thomas as *the* authority in Tristan matters. When landing in Ireland for the second time Tristan finds it more difficult

[1]) I think that Kurnewale is simply corrupted Latin, the Cornu Galliae having become — Cornugal — and finally Kurnewal, just as Bedenis has become Nampetenis (li nain Bedenis) i. e. badly pronounced French as a result of the oral tradition of the poem.

to conceal his coming from Cornwall (Kurnewale) and his French native tongue — for he is accompanied by a number of warriors and and barons and he is probably the only linguist amongst them, except Kurvenal and a few others; in consequence he pretends to come from Normandy (where they also speak French). He can only do this if all his followers are acquainted with the French Language and this is apparently the case; for there is a severe controll this time and the Marshall of Ireland exersises it personally; Tristan disguises himself in order not to be recognized. We furthermore learn that at that time a voyage of 30 days from Normandy to Ireland was not considered to be extraordinarily long — in any case the Marshall is not surprised to hear it; he is furthermore not at all surprised that Tristan gives him an English goblet as a present from Normandy. Anyhow there are linguistic difficulties this time; Tristan himself wants to stand before the "Schiftúr" because he knows the Language of the country and gives orders that during his absence Kurvenal and some others speaking the Language will have have to be there.

---

## DER KAMPF MIT DEM DRACHEN.

When Tristan has killed the "serpant" a word which also Eilhardt uses instead of "trache" — Drache, — he faints near (or in) a brook where the Lord Steward finds him; the latter seeing that the dragon is dead, exlaims in French:

„schevelier, damoiséle,
ma blunde Isôt, ma bêle"

and there can be no doubt that this exlamation must have been in the French text; there is no other reason for Gottfried interrupting his German narration than the simple fact that this expression pleased him. This holds good for nearly all French rhymes in "Tristan" and as often as the German narration is interrupted we may be sure to have French quotations before us. The rhyme for instance

„Wenne kaême dû in Irlant,
Wie slüege dû den sérpánt"
9519-20.

is sure to have been in the French original. The old French word for Ireland is "Irland" and in consequence it rhymed with "serpant". This is easily seen because all lines of the same stanza (strophe) consist of 8 syllables whereas the 2 last ones i. e. those ending with "Irlant" and "serpant" respectively, only contain 7 and the last words of the line were probably given the jambic accent, were thus pronounced in French: *Irlánd, serpánt.* When Isôt and her mother discover Tristan's arms etc., they immediately notice that they are not of Irish origin. The greater part of "der Kampf mit dem Drachem" seems to be Gottfried's own and personal composition, there are few French expressions in it, (at least exclamations) and this very likely on account of the fact that we are in Ireland — thus in a country where a knowledge of French was not usual.....

---

## DER SPLITTER.

The same may be said the present chapter "der Splitter". It is significative that only Tristan uses French expressions, whereas Isôt generally answers in her own Language; by this I mean to say that only the German narrative of Tristan is interrupted by French sayings and locutions whilst the Lady simply uses them "en passant". Isoôt says: "lâ stân, lâ stân" (which is purely German) and Tristan says in the climax of fear: "merzi, bêle Isôt"; to Kurvenal, however, he speaks in „britûnscher wise" which was not Irish, nor English (engelois) but a Language spoken besides French in Bretagne namely Breton, very similar to the Irish tongue, (wie man z. B. neben dem gänzlich verschiedenen Ungarisch in Ungarn gewöhnlich in den besseren Kreisen Deutsch spricht). [1]) And it is not only a single time or exceptionally that Tristan makes use of French when speaking to Isôt.

---

[1]) Or as in Belgium two totally different Languages are spoken.

Is it not astonishing that there are nearly no quotations (or exclamations) in French as far as Isôt is corcerned? With her Tristan speaks French because he knows that Isôt understands him and she replies in Irish knowing that Tristan understands this idiom. When Trîstan says: "merzi, bêle Isôt" she replies: "I übeler man", when Tristan cries: "â bêle Isôt, merzi merzi", she says: "nein, niene tuo" the German narration is not interreputed in her case. The two Isôts, mother and daugther, exclaim in German: "ouwê mir, owê" etc,. The exclamations, direct speech, quoted in a Language other than that in which the poem is written, generally indicate the Language in which the speaker utters them, for instance "Mehr Licht" said Goethe and he died. Also Brangaene, though she understands French, does not say anything in this Language; her exclamations are German, but when Kurvenal sees his master Tristan in best health he says, full of joy in "franzoiser wise" "â béâ duz sir". Can we not deduct from this simple exclamation with sufficient reason that Tristan and Kurvenal were accustomed to speaking French together?

---

## DAS WAHRZEICHEN.

Tristan's companions cannot converse with the "Irlandaeren" because "sine kúnden der lantsprâche nit" (10878). — One thing is sure; namely that in the French text or texts Gottfried consulted, Isôt was either called Yselt, Ysolt or Yseult and that Gottfried has made it Isôt, Isôte for the simple reason that it afforded him a greater variety of rhymes such has: Isôt: brôt, tôt, nôt, rôt, roserôt, morgenrôt" etc. InGottfried's German verses the name Isôt is generally at the end of the verse and in the French usually at the beginning. This is also the case in most French versions; in the Cambridge Fragment it is at the beginning only; in Sneyd and Turin if at the end of a verse it only rhymes with "yolt", "dolt" and "solt"; this holds also good for the Folie Tristan (Oxford); in Berne Ysiaut rhymes with "veut" and "dialt".

Gottfredian French rhyme: Isôt, Isôt, la blunde
Marveil de tû le munde

Gottfredian German rhyme: Nu daz sich Isôt und Isôt
diu sunne und ir morgenrôt

From the French verse quoted above it results with some certainty that Gottfried has consulted all possible texts or versions. In the "Folie Tristan", Oxford 285-86 (Bédier) we read:

„li rais s'en rit e puis respunt:
Ke dit la merveile del mund"

"Merveile del mund " seems thus to have been a name generally given to Isôt — in any case it is not Gottfried's invention and must consequently have been in the French original.

---

## DER MINNETRANK. DAS GESTÄNDNISS.

Der Minnetrank contains at the beginning the usual French rhymes: "barûnen, coumpanjûnen, massenie, amie, aventiure, natiure" etc. As I have already said, the above chapters are much like the love-scenes Alexandre-Soredamors in Cligés, but in "der Minnetrank" French locutions are rare. The last quatrain of "der Minnetrank" is rather interesting:

„si dunket schoener sit dan ê
dâ von sô tiuret minnen ê
gediuhte minne sit als ê
so zergienge schiere minnen ê

I take these verses for a sort of prologue to the celebrated play on words "amer" (lameir) contained in "das Geständniss"; I consider them to be an expression of the poet's desire to construct conspicuous and at the same time pleasing rhymes to counterbalance "amer" of which probably many readers of the epoch knew that they were not the poet's own invention; for, this famous play on words „ameir", „das Geständniss" 11990-12014, can only have been taken from Cligés, [1])

[1]) Regardless of Chrestien's source.

there is trace of it in Thomas — and a play on words represents in most cases an own, original and personal invention. In the first place it is remarkable that Isôt only knows one signification of the word.... for her "lameir" is love and nothing else: "lameir daz ist min nôt, lameir daz waeret mir den muôt, lameir ist daz mir leide tuôt". Tristan, knowing French much better, quotes the different meanings of the word: "lameir daz waere minnen, l'ameir bitter, la meir mer". He explains the various meanings to her:

„mer unde sûr sint iuwer nôt,
iu smecket mer unde wint:
ich waene, iu diu zwei bitter sint"

Isôt, however, calls sê, what Tristan calls mer:

„mir entsmécket weder luft noch sê,
lameir al eine tuot mir wê".

As far as Brangaene is concerned, her exclamations remain German as those of her mistress; "ouwi" she says to herself, "nû verstân ich mich". A soon as the narrative sets in again French expressions and rhymes recommence: "ameiren und amûren" etc. *It strikes me that Brangaene addresses Isôt: "herzefrouwe, schoene Isôt"*, 12153, *just as Tristan addresses Isôt in verse* 18270 *which we have already compared with Cambridge Fragment and where Thomas uses "bele amie"*. "Herzefrouwe, schoene Isôt" seems consequently to have been a favourite term of Gottfried and can thus not have been taken from Thomas. I believe that French words at the beginning or in the middle of lines have seldom been in the original, as: "ir amis unde ir arzâtin", 12166. Similar to the preceding chapter, also "das Geständnis" ends with the sonorous rhymes: "kinden, vinden, kinden, vinden" forming, in my opinion, a sort of epilogue to "ameir" just as I have spoken of "ê, ê, ê, ê" as a prologue.

## BRANGAENE. ROTTE UND HARFE. MARJODO. LIST WIDER LIST.

When Tristan, Isôt and Brangaene arrive at King Marke's Court French exclaamations set in again:

Isôt, Isôt, la blunde,
Marveil de tout le munde.
12563-64.

For the reasons already stated, Gottfried translates his verses into German:

„Isôt diu ist besunder
ueber al die werlt ein wunder.
12565-66.

I should like to point out that when rejecting the version according to which King Marke should have drunk the rest of the love potion, Gottfried does not refer to Thomas, but simply says:

„nein, des trankes was nit mê,
Brangaene warf es in den sê.
12659-60.

Thus in contradiction to Thomas (Saga) in which Marke takes the remainder of the philtre. Also when rejecting the versions of the golden hair Gottfried does not cite Thomas as an authority:

„si lesent an Tristande,
daz ein swálwe ze Irlande etc.
8605-6.

In this chapter the exclamations of both Brangaene and Isôt are German: "owê, trût frouwe, nein frouwe",etc.; in my opinion the absence of French locutions signifies that these passages are Gottfried's original compositions.

Lines 13125-26 in "Rotte und Harfe":

„geschoenet unde gezieret
ze wunsche gécordieret"

can have been in the French original where gezieret-orné may have rhymed with ac(c)ordée — geécordieret. The Language at King Marke's court seems to have been French. When Gandin comes to Isôt she addresses him in this Language i. e. she receives him quite officially for she might have greeted him in their mutual native tongue; Irish; Gottfried has probably taken the verses:

„dé vus sal, messire Gandin"
13137.

from his French text; [1]) as to Gandin, being in a foreign country where French was the usual Language, he addresses persons he does not know in French; when Tristan comes to the shore he speaks French with him, for he does not know him, Tristan having been absent (hunting) when he (Gandin) was singing before King Marke. Therefore he says to Tristan:

„dê te saut, beâs harpiers" to which Tristan replies: "merzi gentil schevaliers"
12301-2.

Tristan being an excellent linguist can pretend to be of Irish nationality — and after this French locutions and terms cease.

In the chapters "Marjodo" and "List wider List" the French Element is of no importance i. e. there are no French expressions and quotations.

---

[1]) On the other hand it may also be possible that Gottfried wishes to put stress on Isôtes intelligence by showing the progress she has made in French in the comparatively short time she has been at King Marke's court.

# MELOT. BELAUSCHTES STELLDICHEIN.

The name of the dwarf Melôt petit von Aquitan (misprinted Aquilan, in Bédier, I. p. 191) must have been in the original Gottfried had before him. He is not mentioned in Thomas, neither in Saga nor Sir Tristrem — but the continuators of Gottfried refer to him; also in the Czech Tristram he is mentioned. The name is continental: Aquitania South Western part of Gaul. The name Melôt may be derived from the Greek "melas"= black; as a dwarf he was of course "petit" and the name might thus signify: The little black man from Aquitania. However well established Loth's theory of names in Tristan may be [1]) it is remarkable that most names of whatever origin they may be convey a perfectly clear sense in French: So for instance Drostan-Tristan =Tantris. According to Loth (Contributions, page 82). Petitcru is or was a widely spread name in the South-Eastern part of England, still existing to-day in Eastern Cornwall as Pettigrew (Petty, French petit). But we must not forget that the name stated by Loth is a Family name whereas in Tristan Petitcru is a dog; also this name is quite clear in French: (Petit) creu from croistre, past participle creu i. e. *small grown.* If Corvenal (Kurvenal) is derived from Gorwenwal (Loth, Contributions, page 103) it is given a very concise meaning in French as Governal (Beroul) Guvernal (Thomas) Gouvernal (Prose) i. e. gouverner. This is the more remarkable as in corrupted names it is generally not so easy to determine the exact meaning; the name Nampetenis for instance has no sense in German without knowing the etymology, Kurvenal is only comprehensible to philologists. The signification of names like Tristan, Tantris, Gouvernal etc., is understood by every Frenchman: Gouvernal (gouvernail, gouverneur, gouvernement, gouverner) Petitcrëu (contrary grand cru) etc. Let us suppose that Tristan's mother were called Edelweiss in the French texts, would the average French reader understand that it meant Noble Blanche? To the names above stated we may add purely French names as (Rual) li Foitenant, Blanchefleur, li duc (Morgan) etc. Tristan writes the initials T and I on olive-wood; did these trees

---

[1]) J. Loth, Contributions à l'Etude des Romans de la Table Ronde, p. 60-112, Chapt.: Le Cornwall et le Roman de Tristan.

grow in Cornwall at the time or were they only used as ornamental trees? In this case it would have been very dangerous for the lovers to cut their branches as it might have roused the suspicious attention of Marke, Melôt and Marjodo! In "Belauschtes Stelldichein" the French Element i. e. words, locutions, is nihil; as asual French words are used as soon as direct speech passages are interrupted and the descriptive sets in; so in 14913-14:

siuftende unde trûerende,
ameirende unde amûrende.

---

## DAS GLÜHENDE EISEN. PETITCRIU. DIE VERBANNUNG.

In "das glühende Eisen" we come accross the word pônder — poindre — to jump ets., a word which also Chrestien uses in Cligés, Erec etc., whereas I have not meet with the word in Thomas. This time we are told to be in England viz in Lunders z'Engeland (Lundres in Thomas) where a "concilje" is to be held. Gottfried speaks here of the bischof von Tamise; the old Tumesis is given the (French) name Tamise and is apparently taken from the original. The "concilje" is finally fixed to take place at Karliûn. From a linguistical and geographical point of view is dificult to determine whether the scene is really in England, as there are no indications tending to solve the problem. Tristan proceeds to the castle of Duke Gilan in Swales; French words set in again in the description of Petitcriu so lazûre, mixture (15833-34) but there are reasons to believe that they are Gottfried's own and personal constructions. The turning: "Urgan le vilus haete ûf der rivâgen hus" must have been taken from the original. The Duke seems to speak French with Tristan — when the latter has killed the giant he says to him:

„à bienvenjanz, gentil Tristan".

This verse as well as rhyme 1642-43:

„Ich sluog Urgânen li viliu
durch niht wân durch Petitcriu".

can, in my opinion, only be direct quotations.

We now find the usual rhymes: Tintjôel, petit Melot and "samblanze" probably originally at end of verse. In "die Verbannung" we find the usual massenie, cumpanie; however 16619-20 is rather striking:

„an minnen cumpanie
deist michel torperie"

yet I take them for Gottfried's own construction.

---

## DIE MINNEGROTTE.

Gottfried calls the grotto: "La fossiur de la gent amant" and it is evident that he must have seen the name somewhere, though critics generally admit (Piquet, L'Originalité, La Grotte d'Amour, chapt XXVII, page 280) that the description of the grotto, exterior and interior, is Gottfried's own work; in any case it is quite different to that of Thomas (Saga). The rhymes in plânje, funtânje, massenie and mangerie are probably Gottfredian constructions; this would also hold good for the sporadic French substantives like spinele, prâerie etc. I am, however, of the opinion, that rhymes 17228-29, where where he repeats the name of the grotto, must have been in some text the poet consulted:

„wol z'einer klûse wart benant
la fossiur' à la gent amant.

The substantive fossiur' is apostrophized in the denomination of the grotto and it is not apostrophized when using it as a rhymes, for instance âventiure, fossiure. In the verses quoted above it would have much better suited the German text i. e. rythme in this case if the apostrophe were missing; thus: La fossiure â la gent amant; I deduct from this that Gottfried has faithfully adapted the name from the Original he consulted.

---

## ENTDECKUNG UND VERSÖHNUNG. SCHEIDEN UND MEIDEN.

In this chapters we find quite a number of French words and expressions, most of them being musical terms. We first meet 17359-60 with organieren, salûtieren, which are undoubtedly Gottfredian constructions; this, however, does not seem to be the case 17375-76:

„diu dâ schantoit und discantoit
ir schanzûn unde ir refloit.

These terms can hardly constitute a part of Gottfried's own vocabulary, as they do not only demand a thorough knowledge of French but also of Music and I do not think that French musical terms were generally known outside France more than seven hundred years ago. I also think that verse 17389-90.

„der boume florie,
diu liehte prârie.

are simply a translation. In "Scheiden und Meiden" the descriptions of nature, trees, flowers, the comparisons used in connection with same etc. etc., are purely German. In this chapter we are coming to verses 18197 where the direct comparision with Thomas can begin. As I have already pointed out none of the French exclamations used by Gottfried are to be found in Thomas viz: exclamations in Thomas are not in Gotfried and vice versa!

In 18258-59 Gottfried says: ....armes wip! Thomas says: Amie Yseut! In 18270 Gottfried says: herzefrouwe, schoene Isôt. Thomas says: bele amie! In 18288 Gottfried says: dûze amie, bêle Isôt, Thomas uses no exclamation! I find this "strikingly strange" and leave it to impartial investigation to draw the necessary conclusion.

---

## ISOT ALS BLANCHE MAINS.

In this chapter geographical indications are rather vague and confusing. Tristan and his "massenie" are going to "Normandie" and later on he proceeds to "Allemanje" crossing the "Schampanje". He returns to Normandie by the same route and then proceeds to Parmenie; all

this in perfectly clear; between "Britanje" and "Engelant" there is a Duchy called: Arundel and the children of the Duke and Duchess are called: "Isôt als blanche mains" (Yseut aux blanches mains) and Kaedin "li frains" thus purely French names in apparently English surroundings. Rugier von Doleise, Nantenis von Hante and Rigolin von Nante (Nantes) suddenly appear and the general war cry seems also to have been French:

„hie „schevelier Hante,
Doleise unde Nante!"
dort; „Karke un Arundêle".
18883-85.

and they are presumably half translated French exclamations, most probably from the text used by Eilhard [1]) I should say the same of 19035-36:

„ez ist diu von Arundêle
und niht Isôt la bêle" (et non Yseut la belle)

In 19215-20 we finally meet with 2 of the most beautiful lines of the whole Gottfredian and any Tristan:

„Isôt ma drûe, Isôt m'amie
en vûs ma mort, en vûs ma vie:

They are not in Thomas and, if they had been, they ought to have been here! It is very possible that Gottfried has composed these lines himself, but if they had to (or have to) harmonize with the preceding verse: "und sang ie diz refloit dar in" then the verses in question have to be pronounced in a manner that the e in drue and amie is mute; but according to the general rule it is also very likely that they have been taken from the text Gottfried had before him; the lines are repeated in 19413-14 for which the above remarks also hold good. The references to the Rhine his native river, etc. sufficiently show the independent concentration of Gottfried's mind and they ought amply to prove the sovereignty with which the great poet masters and treats the subject.

---

[1]) The names Nantenis von Hante and Rigolin von Nante may be the Eilhardian Nampeténis and Riôle von Nantis; a proof that Gottfried consulted several French texts.

## CONCLUSION.

In the preceding observations I have quoted the most salient and important French words, locutions and rhymes Gottfried of Strasbourg has used in his Master-Work Tristan und Isolde. I have expressed the opinion that the greater part of these terms was probably contained in the French text or texts the author had before him. I have, furthermare, ventured to assert that the influence of Thomas is generally overestimated and that Gottfried is not only dependent on Thomas, that there are essential differences between the Thomas and Gottfried styles, that, in my opinion, Gottfried is much more akin as far a spoetical art and craft are concerned, to the greatest French poet of the Middle Ages — Chrestien de Troyes, and that, according to all probability, he has seen the lost Tristan manuscript and perhaps the author himself. I hope to have shown with sufficient clearness that, where a direct comparison with his source is possible, Gottfried of Strasbourg has by no means slavishly followed it, that, on the contrary he has put upon the passages with which such comparison is possible, the stamp of his genial and superior mind in a degree that we may justly and rightly consider them his own mental property.

Gottfried has never concealed and never tried to conceal his source or sources and by doing so has made Thomas von Britanje more popular and more widely known than he would have ever been by his own poetical merits! However beautiful the Tristan of Thomas may be — it cannot compare with that of Gottfried whom without any exxagereration we may call the Tristan writer par excellence. I have thus said that it is not Thomas! But it is neither the crude Eilhard, neither the "effect-straining" Béroul nor the reporter and journalist Robert, it is the gentle and discriminating Gottfried, the poet by the grace of God and the Muses. It is Gottfried of Strasbourg who by the views on Love, Life, Art and Religion expressed in Tristan and Isolde is a few centuries ahead of his time; but at the same time I have said — and I repeat — that he is undoubtedly much indebted to his spiritual model, (perhaps his teacher and mentor), Chrestien de Troyes whom he may have known personally. As to the question: was Gottfried of

Strasbourg Master in the sense of Master of Arts, I hope to have given a satisfactory answer. The manyfold allusions to and quotations from Classic, and especially Greek Literature, may strengthen us in the belief that he was, and that in this case he must have sojourned in France. My views as to adaption and translation have been clearly stated. However free and however faithful a translation may be it will be a translation! Fitzgerald's version of the Rhoubayât for instance, in spite of its indeniable excellence and to which the words of Bédier "ces vers traduits semblent être, sont en effet, des créations toutes neuves" might be much more justly applied — is and will remain the work of Omar Khayam! This would also hold good for the Schlegel-Tieck translation of Shakespeare! As far as action, plot and order of action are concerned I once more refer to the Introduction to „Woerterbuch zu Kristian von Troyes sämtlichen Werken", where the compiler Wendelin Foerster, quotes Zarncke (Beitr. S. 202) on the subject, who in turn quotes Lachmann, page 188. "Weil Lachmann [1]) gesagt hat, dass der mittelalterliche Dichter niemals erfunden, sondern stets nur dargestellt habe; die Sage entstehe, wachse und treibe ihr geheimnisvolles Wesen für sich; dem Dichter, dem Verfasser einer einzelnen poetischen Erzählung gehöre von der Fabel nichts Wesentliches, Eigentümliches an". Dieses Dictum Lachmanns gilt im Bereiche der Schule noch heute unbedingt. Müllenhoff z. B. behauptet [2]) im Nibelungenlied sei jeder Hieb, jede Bewegung durch die Sage gegeben gewesen". This, of course, is exaggerated but not absolutely and wholly void of truth. The greatest poets have in general not invented the plot of their works; they have either followed the traditions of Sagas or legends or certain historical "données" (Homer, Corneille, Racine, Voltaire, Shakespeare, Goethe, Schiller Oehlenschlaeger etc.) facts thus from which they could not possibly deviate too much without inviting (historical) criticism (Shakespeare, Caesar dying at Capitol, Schiller, Jeanne d'Arc dying on battlefield etc.).

So there is nothing astonishing in a certain similarity of action, especially in the case of medieval compositions. What matters much

[1]) Ueber das Hildebrandlied, S. 1.
[2]) Kudrun, S. 123.

more is, in my opinion, the manner in which the events are described and the art with which the feelings of heart and soul are depicted in short — the power of psychological observation and representation, are those factors, which impart lasting value to works of Literature, provided that poetical charm emanates from the whole. Let us only take one example to illustrate the difference of poetical sentiment and descriptions between Gottfried and Thomas. Gottfried describes Petitcrëu:

„sin hundelin Petitcriu
sines hérzen spil van Aveliu —
ein purper edel unde rich —
daz zunge nie sô redehaft
noch herze nie sô wise wart,
daz sine schoene und sinen art
kunde geschriben oder gesagen;
sin varwe was enein getragen
mit alsó fremeden liste,
daz niemen rehte wiste
von welher varve ez waere. ....etc.

How does Thomas (Saga) describe the wonderful little dog? He says: It was so red as if its skin had been turned! I do not uppose that Gottfried would ever have used such comparisons. But yet, Gottfried owes much to all the poets whose works he consulted and studied for they faciltated the composition of his immortal Tristan.

Vu et Permis d'imprimer:

Le Recteur de l'Académie

L. GÉRARD — VARET.

---

Vu et lu:

Le Doyen de la Faculté des Lettres

E. GALLETIER.